

THE
QUARTERLY
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

VOLUME VIII.—NUMBER III.

SEPTEMBER, 1836.

ART. I.—CONNECTION BETWEEN EGYPTIAN AND JEWISH
HISTORY.

Essay on the Hieroglyphic System of M. Champollion, Jun., and on the advantages which it offers to sacred criticism. By J. G. H. GREPPO. Translated from the French by Isaac Stuart, with notes and illustrations. 8vo. Boston: 1830.

THE antiquarian hails with bursts of rapture the dawn of every ray of light which promises to reveal any thing concerning the early history of nations, and bids thrice welcome to the discovery of any additional evidence that tends to clear up the doubts, or to remove the obscurity which hangs over the story of their infancy; and most gladly does the biblical critic listen to a revelation which unfolds aught of past ages; more especially when it relates to a country whose history for a long time was so intimately blended with that of the church of God, as was the Egyptian.

It has at all times been a favorite pursuit with both the antiquary and critic, to trace the coincidences in the history of primitive nations,—to mark the similarity of their customs and manners,—the sameness of their religion and laws; but never, until the announcement that the indefatigable labors of Champollion and Dr. Young had resulted in the discovery of the long lost key to the Egyptian hieroglyphics, did this subject present inducements which attracted the attention of all christendom. *What will be its effect on the early history of Egypt?* anxiously inquired the antiquarian. *What on the sacred record?* asked the christian and critic. Will the tale of these mysterious emblems confirm or contradict the details of the sacred history?

Nor was this lively interest felt without a cause. The triumph of the infidel over the *fabulous* claims of the Chinese chronology,

and the peans sung over the imaginary antiquity of the Zodiacs of Dendera and Esne, were then, as now, fresh in the minds of many living. It was not unnatural, therefore, nor irrelevant, to inquire, whether the same round was to be run over the record of these time-enduring monuments,—whether the same extravagant claims were to be based upon them, to be beaten down and dissipated in like manner, by a more extended research, and a more critical examination.* The result, however, has shown, that so far from invalidating any of the numerous historical relations of the bible, to the extent of which they are at all applicable, they confirm in a striking manner the statements of the sacred page.

We have not now either time or space to enable us to enter into a history of the discovery of which we have spoken; nor would it be within the scope of this article to enter into a detail of the particular results to which it has led. For the present we can only assure such of our readers as are not already acquainted with the fact, that the course pursued by the discoverers is certain, and the results to which it leads perfectly satisfactory,—that the conclusions they have drawn are such as must satisfy the severest critic. For information on this subject, we must now refer them to the work, the title of which stands at the head of our article, and which has for some time been before the public,—a work we are happy to be able to recommend for their perusal, as one from which they will derive both instruction and amusement, and which with the exception of a few points of minor consequence, is one of decided merit, and a good reference for authority. There are also various other works on the same subject, which we should be glad to see circulated among our citizens; a list of some of them we add in a note.†

Bidding adieu, then, to the history of our subject, we shall plunge in *medias res*, and hasten to acquaint our readers with some of the advantages to be derived by biblical scholars from a study of the early Egyptian history, and more especially from that furnished us in a translation of the hieroglyphics.

* Greppo has given a very good account of the Zodiacs, in p. 2, c. 10; and for an account of the Hindoo, Indian, and Chinese chronology and astronomy, see Hist. Brit. Ind. vol. ii. c. 6. vol. iii. c. 13. 3 vols. 8vo. New-York. 1832.

† The following contains a list of some of the most important works referred to in the text: *Précis du Système, Hieroglyphique*, of M. Champollion, Jun.: *Pantheon Egyptien: Collection des Personages Mythologiques de l'Ancienne Egypt d'Après les Monuments: avec texte explicatif*, by the same author: *Materia Hieroglyphica; containing the Egyptian Pantheon, and the succession of the Pharaohs from the earliest time to the conquest of Alexander*; by G. J. Wilkinson, Esq.: *I Monumenti dell' Egitto e della Nubia disegnati dalla spedizione scientifico-literaria Toscana in Egitto; distribuiti in ordine di materie interpretati ed illustrati dal Dottore Ippollito Rossellini*.

The last three mentioned works are reviewed in the January number of the Foreign Quarterly Review, 1836; the last two with others in the Edinburgh Review for Feb. 1835.

It may, however, be necessary for us to give a brief list of the materials for the early history of Egypt, possessed before the discovery of the reading of the hieroglyphics. They were,

1. *The old Chronographer*, which Scaliger, Prideaux, and some others, supposed to be an abridgment of the work next named, while Shuckford and others believe it to have been the work of another author.*

2. *The Universal History of Egypt*, by Manetho, a priest of Heliopolis, and keeper of the sacred books of Egypt, in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, by whose command he compiled his work from the memorials contained in these books, and from the inscriptions then existing on the temples and columns;—a work executed soon after the translation of the Septuagint. Concerning its authorship there is no doubt, though there is concerning the authenticity of many statements said to have been contained in it. We think, however, that from the days of Abraham until the close of his history, Manetho made use of authentic documents,—authentic at least in their outline, if not in detail; and though previous to this time, his history, if properly understood, like *all* the history of the primitive nations,—that only which is contained in the bible excepted,—is disfigured by the absurdity of the fables which compose it; yet from that time downward, the chronology of Manetho, if we do not mistake the tendency of the proof afforded by Egyptian monuments and Pharonic legends, bids fair to regain some of the reputation it enjoyed in the early ages of the christian church. The principal objection which has been urged against Manetho, relates to his chronology, but which we shall see is entitled to little weight.

3. The third source of early Egyptian history, is the catalogue of the kings of the *Theban and Diospolitan families*, by Eratosthenes, a Cyrenian, of great genius, eminence, and learning, and keeper of the royal library of Alexandria in the time of Ptolemy Euergetes.

4. *The Chronographia* of Sextus Julius, surnamed Africanus, who flourished under Heliogabulus, at the commencement of the third century, and who incorporated *the universal history of Egypt* into his own work. This work, too, is lost.

5. *The Chronicon* of Eusebius Pamphilus, bishop of Cesarea, about A. D. 324, which contains much matter from Manetho.

6. *The Chronographia* of Georges, a monk, who lived at the commencement of the eighth century of the Christian era, surnamed *Syncellus*, from the office he discharged; and which was

* On the subject of these authorities, see Shuckford's *Connection*, b. 11. Prideaux, b. 1, b. 7. Stillingleet, *Origines Sacrae*, b. 1, c. 2. Greppo, p. 2, c. 7 and 8. Eusebius *Chron.* Calmet *Bib. Dic. in loco*.

principally compiled from Julius Africanus, the work of Manetho having been lost before the days of this author.

7. To these may be added a few extracts from Manetho, by Josephus, and the early ecclesiastical writers of the christian church, which, together with the works above enumerated, made up almost the entire body of the early history of Egypt. These few and scanty materials have furnished matter for numerous chronological hypotheses, no one of which could be relied upon; and it was not until since the translation of a record, second only to inspiration in its *durability*, that we have been able to determine with accuracy the various epochs of Egyptian history.

We have before intimated, that the objections against the chronology of Manetho, are not of much force, and we shall state, as briefly as possible, our reasons for this opinion. It was a dogma of the Egyptian schools, that in a cycle of 36,525 years, the whole order of nature and the universe made a complete revolution, so that "what had been," was again in 36,525 years, "and what was would be" in the same time. In accordance with this opinion, it seems probable, that Manetho framed the duration of his dynasties, filling up the ante-diluvian period, or the first fifteen of them, with gods, demi-gods, and heroes.* If we suppose these fifteen dynasties to have included their ante-diluvian ancestors, and reduce the years, which at first consisted of *one* month,† then of *four*,‡ and afterwards of twelve months, to the standard of the latter; the chronology of Manetho is brought within the limits of the chronology of the bible, according to the Alexandrian, Antiochian, and Constantinopolitan versions.§

Jahn, who has with much care and pains digested the dynasties of our author, from Julius Africanus and Eusebius,|| has shown, that from the reign of Menes, the first mortal king, or more probably the first mortal, and therefore identical with the Adam of the bible, to the accession of Cambyses of Persia to the throne of Egypt, was 4,832 years; and according to the chronology of Dr. Hales, who nearly coincides with the Septuagint, from the creation of man to the same period, was 4,882 years; exceeding by fifty years the time of Manetho. The Antiochian and Constantinopolitan versions make the time still longer. Again, if the

* Shuckford, b. 11. We think this opinion quite probable, notwithstanding the objections which have been urged against it.

† Plut. in Numa. Varro. Lact. Orig. l. 2, c. 12. Still. Orig. Sac. l. 1. 2. sec. 2. Rob. Ed. Cal. Bib. Dic.

‡ Plut. and Still. *ubi sup.* Diod. Sic. l. 1, c. 26. Aug. De. Civit. Dei. l. 12, c. 10. Voss. de Idol. l. 1, c. 28.

§ The creation of man took place, before the birth of Christ, according to Usher, 4,000 years; Calmet, 400; Dr. Hales, 5,411; LXX, 5,498; Antiochian version, 5,488; Constantinopolitan, 5,504 years.

|| Ap. Hist. Heb. Commonwealth.

eighteenth dynasty ascended the throne of Egypt after Jacob went down into that country, as we have reason to believe, then do the dates of Manetho harmonize with the LXX; for, according to Dr. Hales, from the descent of Jacob to the reign of Cambyses, was 1,343 years, while from the accession of this dynasty to Cambyses, according to Manetho, was 1,270; making the sojourn of the children of Israel begin 73 years before the commencement of the reign of this family. The agreement between the chronology of Manetho and that of the Septuagint, when considered in connection with the fact, that the historian of Egypt, either had, or might have had, this version of the scripture before him, would almost persuade us, that the *Menes* of the one answered to the *Adam* of the other; and that the chronology of the former was copied from, or corrected by, the dates of the latter.

Another mode of reconciling the dynasties of our author with probability, has been suggested and defended; whereby the different families are to be reckoned contemporaneous and not successive. In this manner, Taylor, in his edition of Calmet, reduces the whole duration of all the dynasties to 1,400 years, while Shuckford makes them 1,710, Silberschlag 1,993 years, and others still some different number.* But this seems to us to be an entire departure from the whole system of Manetho, and in direct contradiction to the whole current of ancient authorities; so that it cannot therefore be admitted.

In the foregoing calculations, we have determined the various epochs by reference to biblical chronology, but we can determine most of them equally well without this aid.

The Egyptians invented and used a cycle, called the *sothaic*, and sometimes the *cynic*, consisting of 1,461 years of 360 days, or 1,460 years of 365 days, nearly. This cycle, according to Censorinus, ended the year 138 of the christian era, and therefore commenced B. C. 1,322. Now, according to Theon, this cycle commenced under the reign of *Menephes*, or *Amenephes*, the third king of the nineteenth dynasty. But Menephes reigned 40 years, and hence we need another date to ascertain the commencement of the cycle; and this we are enabled to procure from Manetho. Thus he says, that an invasion of the Shepherds took place in the sixth year of the reign of Cencharis, called also Timaeus, 270 years before the accession of the 18th dynasty, and that this year was the 700th of the cynic cycle. Now if we add to this 700 years, the 270 which elapsed before the 18th dynasty came to the throne of Egypt, and also the 348 years in which that family reigned over Egypt, together with the 121 years occupied

* Tay. Cal. *in loco*. Shuck. b. 11. Silb. in Jahn Hist. Heb. Com. *ad finem*.

by the reigns of the first two kings of the 19th dynasty, we have 1,439, the year of the cycle in which Menephes came to the throne of Egypt, making the cycle end in the 32d year of his reign.* It may perhaps be questioned, whether Censorinus, at the late period in which he lived, could know with any certainty the exact year in which the *cynic cycle* terminated; but there is, nevertheless, an agreement between this calculation and the chronology of the Hebrew scriptures, no less striking than that already spoken of between Manetho and the Septuagint. Thus, according to the last calculation, the accession of the 19th dynasty took place 1,474 years before the christian era, or thirteen years after the Exodus, following the chronology of Usher and Calmet; a result which we have reason to believe does not differ very much from the truth.

But it is not in determining dates, which from the very nature of the case are liable to great uncertainty, that we are to derive the advantages already alluded to, from a study of Egyptian antiquities; but it is rather the confirmation which the sacred history receives from the detail of facts contained in the history of that country, coinciding with or illustrating many direct and incidental allusions of the bible to the history and habits, the customs and manners of the Egyptians.

No one who has read his bible with the slightest attention, can have failed to notice a wonderful change in the character and feelings of the Egyptian sovereigns, between the days of Abraham and those of Joseph; and a change which nothing in the scriptures enables us to account for. When the former, who was "very rich in *catle*, and silver, and gold,"† was driven by famine into the land of Egypt, he found no difficulty in conversing with Pharaoh, their king, who also had abundance of "sheep and oxen, he asses and she asses, with camels, with men servants and maid servants,"‡ and a few years subsequent, the patriarch received a present from Abimelech, another of their sovereigns, "of *sheep and oxen*, men servants and maid servants," with permission "to dwell where it pleased him."§ So, too, a short time after, this king of Egypt received a present of like kind from the hand of Abraham;|| but in the days of Joseph, "every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians," and the children of the patriarch were obliged to converse with those people through the medium of an interpreter.¶ Again, after the "death of Joseph, his brethren, and all that generation, *there arose a king in Egypt which knew not Joseph*," and who enslaved and oppressed the people his predecessors had treated with kindness.

* For authority for the statements in regard to the *cynic cycle*, see Greppo, p. 2, c. 3, and authorities there quoted.

† Gen. xiii. 2. ‡ Ib. xii. 16. § Ib. xx. 16. || Ib. xxi. 27. ¶ Ib. xliii. 34; xlii. 23.

In all these accounts we seem to perceive recognitions of some leading feature, some prominent characteristic of the sovereigns of Egypt, and of the people over which they ruled; intimations most fully confirmed by the testimony of Manetho, and by the reading of the hieroglyphics. Thus we learn from the fragments of Manetho, that sometime before the accession of the eighteenth dynasty, Egypt was invaded and conquered by a race of foreigners, called by that historian, *Hykshos*, *Shepherds*, *Shepherd-kings*, or *Pastor-kings*; and who destroyed and laid waste the temples, edifices and monuments of the preceeding families. This account of Manetho is most fully confirmed by the Pharonic legends, as well as by the fact, that many specimens of the early Egyptian architecture are incorporated into the temples of the eighteenth dynasty, thereby demonstratng the truth of this universal history of Egypt. These foreigners, whom Manetho calls "men of ignoble birth from the eastern parts,"* probably from the plains of Assyria, and speaking the language of Abraham, or the Chaldee tongue,† held the throne of Egypt, according to Greppo, 270 years, but according to Jahn, 284 years. From the chronology of Manetho, and the Egyptian monuments, it is evident, that this family governed Egypt in the days of Abraham, and hence the ability of the patriarch to converse with Pharaoh; and hence, also, the amity that subsisted between them.

Between the shepherd-kings and some part of the Egyptians, war raged with various success, until the king of Thebes drove out the shepherds, and with his family held the throne 143 years, when they were succeeded by the family of Diospolis, the rightful sovereign of Egypt.‡ The Theban race of kings, who were also conquerors of lower Egypt, and who prevented the rightful sovereigns from returning to the throne of their fathers, were nevertheless lenient, compared with the *shepherd-kings*, in the treatment of their subjects; permitting them to return from the pastoral life, into which they had been forced, and allowing them to give full scope to their hatred against their former tyrants. The occupation of shepherds, by reminding them as it did of their former servitude, was hateful, and "every shepherd became an abomination to the Egyptians." It was also under these kings, that the viceroyship of Joseph took place, and we may well suppose, that a visit from *ten shepherds*, in the persons of the sons of Jacob, men of warlike aspect, so soon after their deliverance from bondage, would arouse in their minds

* Josephus against Apion. b. 1, c. 14.

† That the Chaldee was the language of Abraham, see Le Clerc Prog. Pent. de lingua Heb. sec. 1. Walton's Prog. 2, 13—19. Selden Prog. de diis Syriis, c. 2. Rees Cyclopaedia, art. Hebrew character.

‡ With Eusebius, we suppose the *Phenician shepherd-kings* to have formed the 16th dynasty, and after Julius Africanus, we call the 17th *Theban*.

a suspicion of another contemplated invasion ; and that the vice-roy, in charging his brethren with being spies, only echoed the popular feelings of his subjects. To this he would be prompted by a variety of considerations, beside the desire to test the strength of their filial affection for Benjamin. Duty to his king, policy and prudence, imperatively demanded this from him. It was necessary for him to satisfy himself of the rectitude of their intentions, and to allay in the minds of the Egyptians all fear of his being in league with the hateful shepherds ;—a suspicion that would have ruined his interest at the court of Pharaoh, and might have cost him his life. These considerations, also, would render that course of conduct just and necessary, which otherwise must have appeared very extraordinary.

We have already shown, that the dates furnished by Manetho, Censorinus and Theon, enable us to fix the Exodus in the reign of *Ramses, Amenephes, or Menephes*, the last king of the 18th dynasty, and that it took place thirteen years before the end of his reign, or in the 27th year of it ; but Champollion and Greppo, by reasoning more satisfactory to us, have attempted to fix it ten years earlier. We therefore follow this calculation as being the most probable, and we feel ourselves obliged to understand *literally* the prophecy made to Abraham, that “ his seed should be a stranger in a land that was not theirs, and should serve the inhabitants thereof, and be afflicted and oppressed by them *four hundred years* ;”* and consequently, we suppose, that they were in Egypt from the descent of Jacob to the time of the Exodus, 408 years.† We say 408 years, because the prophecy assures us, that

* Gen. xv. 13.

† This supposition is opposed to the common notion, that the affliction spoken of in the prophecy, began with the sojourn of Abraham in that country. It is not entirely without its difficulties, but where there is one objection to our hypothesis, to us it seems that there are several to the other. We cannot now devote time to a critical examination of this point, and if we could, the brief space of a single note would not furnish sufficient scope for doing so. We can therefore only mention a few of the reasons why we adopt the one and reject the other. We have, then, in favor of our interpretation, the fact, that it gives a clear, consistent, and rational interpretation of the prophecy in question ; accounts for all the strange revolutions in Egyptian customs and manners, which took place at that time ; and furnishes time in which seventy souls might have increased to a million and a half, the smallest possible number which could have furnished “ 603,550 men, from twenty years and upwards,” ready to go forth to battle.

To the other hypothesis we object. 1. That it makes Abraham suffer in person the affliction of his seed, and that too from a king with whom he was in alliance, and when in a foreign country. 2. That for nearly two hundred years of this period, the children of Abraham had no communication with the Egyptians, and therefore could not be afflicted by them. 3. It allows less than two hundred years for an increase of seventy souls to more than 1,500,000, and which *would require them to double not less than sixteen times*. To the first two of these objections no answer can be given, but in reply to the last, it has been said, that the statement is *possible when we recollect*,—1. “ The fruitfulness of the Hebrew.

the seed of Abraham should serve 400 years, and Moses expressly asserts, that the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 years.* Now Joseph was seventeen years old when he was sold into slavery, and was thirty when he stood before Pharaoh.† He had therefore been a servant thirteen years, which added to the seven years of plenty in which he was busied in collecting food, and the two years of the famine already elapsed, would make his service twenty-two years, in the second year of the famine, when his father went down to him. Dating the commencement of the 430 years from the beginning of the servitude of the children of Israel, in the person of Joseph, and the 400 years of the prophecy would commence ten years after Jacob's descent into Egypt, or three years after the end of the seven years of famine.

If, then, with Champollion and Greppo, we assign the Exodus to the seventeenth year of *Amenephes*, the descent of Jacob took place 85 years before the accession of the 18th dynasty, or Diospolitan family, to the throne of Egypt, under whom the bondage of the Israelites continued with increasing severity for 325 years. Joseph lived 73 years after his father went into Egypt, he, therefore, "with all that generation, died" in the 85 years just spoken of, and consequently the first sovereign of the 18th dynasty "knew not Joseph." This conclusion, too, is in conformity with the statements of Josephus, that "another family had obtained the throne of Egypt."

In the kings of this race, the characteristics of the oppressors of Israel would naturally, we had almost said necessarily, exist. Burning with hatred against their cruel oppressors, and especially those conquerors who had violated the tombs and temples of their fathers, we should expect to see them actuated by a spirit of revenge, which would be visited on every thing that received the approbation of the "*Pastor-dynasty*." The character, occupation, and institutions of the latter, would be held in aversion by the former; and the people who owed their situation to the kindness or assistance of the one, would be the first to feel the vengeance of the other. Indeed, we can imagine no trait more natural, than

2. The extraordinary fruitfulness of the Egyptians, four or five children being conceived at a birth. 3. The multitude of wives; and 4. The duration of life." (Poole Synop. *in loco*.) To this we rejoin, to the first, that the scripture acquaints us with no such extraordinary increase as this supposes, among the Hebrews or any other nation. 2. That the supposed fruitfulness of the Egyptians is not proved by authority on which any reliance can be placed, Pliny being of all men the most credulous. 3. That it is doubtful whether polygamy actually does any thing towards an increase of population. 4. That if the Israelites were the same in Egypt as before and after their sojourn there, the duration of life did not materially affect the increase of population.

* Ex. xii. 40, 41.

† Gen. xli. 46.

that described in the brief but emphatic phrase: "And there arose a king in Egypt, which knew (or rather, who heeded not) Joseph." The character of shepherds,—the occupation of the Hebrews,—still excited in the mind of an Egyptian a suspicion of enmity, and hence the king expresses his fear, "that in time of war they would join the enemy."*

Doomed to slavery and the mines, the children of the patriarch were now compelled to assist in rearing those towering columns, ponderous walls, and mighty pyramids, which attest the wealth, the ambition, and the power of the monarch that built them; and which, like the nation of slaves that labored at their foundation, still remain to testify to the truth of the sacred history. Surely no human foresight could have imagined, that the labors of this afflicted people would have remained more than 3,500 years, as if witnesses of their own history. But such is the fact; and to this day, the Hebrew, with the physiognomy of a modern Egyptian Jew, and in a dress like all the representations of ancient Alexandrian ones, may be seen sculptured on the massive walls they helped to build, "making bricks and working in the quarries, under the superintendence of Egyptian task masters, and whose bricks, according to their delineation, are precisely the same which may be found in the walls whose date is assignable to that era."† Such coincidences between the Mosaic and Egyptian records could not have been the result of accident; nor can the things they relate be the production of fancy, but they prove incontestibly the truth of both.

There is also another point in this part of the scripture history, which in our opinion receives strong confirmation from the Egyptian; but which requires a construction of a passage of scripture different from the common one. "And they built for Pharaoh treasure-cities, Pithom and Raamses."‡ "Pithom and Raamses," in this passage, are generally supposed to be the name of two treasure-cities which the Israelites built for Pharaoh, but which we suggest were rather names of two Pharaohs who oppressed the children of Israel, and for whom these treasure-cities, or, more properly these magazines were built; or it is possible that they were the names both of the kings who caused them to be built, and of the cities when built. This last, however, we think rather improbable.

We have already supposed the Exodus to have taken place in the seventeenth year of Amenephes, the last king of the 18th dynasty. His predecessor was *Ammesses, Rammesses, or Ramses Meiamoun*, called also *Aegyptus*, who reigned, according to Jahn, 40 years,§ but according to Josephus, 60 years.|| He was pre-

*[Ex. i. 10. †For. Q. Rev. ubi. sup. Art. 3. ‡Ex. i. 11.
§ Man. Dyn.—Hist. Heb. Com. || Adv. Ap. L. 1, c. 15.

ceded by Armes, called also Danaus, who reigned four or five years, and who was himself preceded by *Cherus*, or *Acencherus*, and whose monumental name was *Petamon*. If we suppose the medium between Jahn and Josephus to be the probable duration of the reign of Raamses, then "Moses, who was 80 years old when he stood before Pharaoh,"* was born in the seventh year of the reign of Petamon, and his visit to his brethren, and his flight from that country, which took place when he was 40 years old,† was in the twenty-seventh year of the reign of Raamses. It was probably, therefore, Petamon who issued the cruel mandate "to kill all the male children of the Hebrews;"‡ and from which edict Moses was saved by a stratagem, which served to introduce him to the court of Pharaoh, and to the schools and colleges of the Egyptians. Upon this supposition, two of the most important events in the life of Moses, his birth and flight, occurred in the reign of Petamon and Raamses, and hence also a good reason why they should be commemorated in the writings of Moses, to the exclusion of all others. In accordance with this view of our subject, we should render the verse in question,—“And they built magazines for Pharaoh Pithom and Raamses;” i. e. “for kings Pithom and Raamses.” If this translation be objected to as unauthorized, we might propose others, which are sanctioned by the best grammars and lexicons, and which agree precisely with the above in sense, if not in words. Thus, if with Parkhurst and the old lexicons, we render פִּתּוֹם by *the*; the passage will read: “And they built magazines for Pharaoh, *the* Pithom, and *the* Raamses;” the particle being emphatical and equivalent to the expression, “for Pharaoh, *the one called* Pithom, and for *the one called* Raamses.”§

Again, if with some of the best modern lexicographers, we understand Pharaoh to signify “a mere title of royalty,”|| and translate it accordingly, and render אֶת־ (eth) “under the care of,”¶ the passage will then read: “And they built magazines for the king, *under the care of* Pithom and Raamses,” that is, “under the reigns of Pithom and Raamses,” the cities themselves being the property of the nation, not of the kings.** Either of these renderings, if correct, is decisive of the question in our favor.

* Ex. vii. 7. † Acts vii. 23. ‡ Ex. i. 16.

§ Park. Heb. and Chal. Lex. Moore's Heb. Lex. Wilson's introduction to the Heb. language. Gen. i. n. 4. Svo. Phil. 1812.

|| Gibb's Manual Lexicon Gesenius, *in loco*. This translation receives countenance from, if it is not authorized by, the historical fact, that all the kings of Egypt, before the time of Ptolemy Lagus, were called Pharaoh, which we know to have been more than 1,400 years. ¶ Ibid.

** It had been long ago supposed by some, that the magazine or city of Raamses, was named from the reigning sovereign, and it has been suggested that Pithom might have been the name of his queen, but the order in which they are mentioned is an objection to that supposition, though it favors ours. Besides, it is not known that Raamses had any queen, or if he had, what was her name. Patrick Com. *in loco*.

The supposition, that these words were the proper names of the kings of Egypt, is also strengthened by the etymology of the words themselves. Thus the רעמסס Raamses of Moses, omitting the points,* is identically the same word as the Ramses of Manetho and the monuments. In Pithom and Petamon the identity is not as visible; but rejecting the points from the Hebrew, and the vowels from the Egyptian word, neither of which originally belonged to either language, and the פתם Ptm of the Hebrew, and the Ptmn of the Coptic, leave no doubt of their referring to the same thing or person.† This view of the subject, removes the difficulties under which the learned have for a long time labored in their search for the city of Pithom, and which has led to an insertion of a multiplicity of names in the various versions, no one of which is supported by a single Hebrew manuscript.‡

The only city which has ever been found to answer in the least to Pithom, is the *Patumos* of Herodotus,§ which, according to his statement, was a "small town in Arabia on the borders of the Red Sea," and of course beyond the limits of Egypt, and probably out of the kingdom of the Pharaohs. It is not possible, therefore, that the *Patumos* of Herodotus should be the same as the Pithom of Moses; nor is it probable that powerful monarchs like Petamon and Raamses, with the temples of Karnac before their eyes, would bestow their own names upon a mere magazine of corn. We therefore conclude, that the words in question were the names of men and not of cities, and that the opinion which has so long prevailed, that the name of no one of the Pharaohs, until after the days of Solomon, is mentioned in scripture, is altogether unfounded.

We can also imagine a great variety of reasons besides the ones already enumerated, why these kings should be mentioned and all others omitted, among which may be reckoned the fact,

* In cases like this we do not consider the vowel points as of any authority, regarding them only as the commentary of the Masorites whose invention they were.

† There are several various readings of Pithom. Of the manuscripts examined and numbered by Dr. Kennicut, 80, 84, 132, and 226, read פִּיתוֹם. No. 4, 5, 6, 17, 75, 89, 99, 108, 111, 155, 184, 190, 193, 223, 244, 248, 260, had פִּיתָם and 152 פִּתָם.

‡ The Targum of Jerusalem, has "Tanis and Pelusium." The LLX, Pithone and Ramses, and *On which is Heliopolis*, and with this agrees the Coptic version. The Samaritan and Syriac have Pithone, while the translators of the Arabic have inserted Phaine and Ain-Semesh. *Walton's Polyglot*. These important variations have arisen from an attempt to fix the locality of a city which never existed.

§ B. 2, c. 158. Sir John Marsham, and after him many others, have declared it their opinion, that from the description of Herodotus, it is impossible that Patumos and Pithom should be the same place, and hence they have preferred the reading of the Targ. Jerus. Tanis or Tunis and Pelusium. Patrick Com. in loco. and Poole Synop.

that the persons to whom this history was addressed, must have been personally acquainted with these sovereigns, and had rendered some of their hardest service in obedience to their command. Moses, therefore, to call to their recollection the cruelties they had suffered, named the kings they had served in person, and by whom they had been most barbarously treated.

We cannot leave the consideration of the kings of this 18th dynasty, the most illustrious of all that ever filled the imperial throne of Egypt, without remarking, that it was under their administration that human invention and discovery seems to have made its most rapid strides; and that many arts were at that time carried to such perfection that we in modern days cannot equal them; and that in this age of philosophical investigation the *artes perditæ* of the Pharaohs are yet to be discovered. The art of embalming, of hardening copper to cut stone, and of cutting stone, which we have no materials that will work, are lost.* So may we well inquire, how the Egyptians impelled machinery and vessels in a manner we can only accomplish by the aid of steam? or how, without the assistance of a microscope, they manufactured cameoes and intaglios, so delicate that we require such an instrument to unfold their beauties? The invention of this race of kings, or of their colleges of savans, is almost incredible. The imperishable monuments they reared, have preserved to this time pictorial representations of the state of the arts in those days, which compel us to believe that they invented the arch; that they were acquainted with "the whole process of manufacturing silk and cotton, with all its details of reeling, cording, dyeing, patterning, and weaving;"† and that in the tasteful patterns, and the superb decorations of their household furniture, they were no whit behind this age of magnificence and superfluity. The interior of one of their upholster's workshops, like those of modern days, displayed all the details of their manufacture,—“the cutting and turning, and the implements by which both were executed,—the joining and glueing of parts,—the act of polishing, gilding, and adorning with silken cushions;"‡ if we may rely upon their sculptured delineations of them.

The facts with which we are thus made acquainted, furnish a complete vindication of the Mosaic description of the ark and tabernacle of the Lord, as given in the book of Exodus,§ from the

* If the geological hypothesis concerning the formation and age of rocks be true, it is not impossible that the materials which were easily wrought in the days of the Pharaohs are now entirely unmanageable. This supposition is strengthened by a fact with which miners are well acquainted, viz. that stone when first removed from the quarry is easily wrought, compared with that which has been exposed to the atmosphere for a long time.

† Lond. Quar. Rev. *ubi sup.*

‡ Ibid.

§ Chap. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39.

charge of impracticability of their manufacture, which infidelity has so confidently urged against it; for so far from it being impossible for Bezaleel and Aholiab to make their highwrought ornaments or to perform the exquisite workmanship necessary for their manufacture, neither in any way exceeded that which was common in the country they had just left.

But few specimens of the articles manufactured in that age, have survived the wreck of time, yet examples and copies enough to satisfy the most sceptical of the truth of our positions are sculptured on the few remains of their architecture, and which by the diligence of the learned, will soon be, through faithful copies, presented to the inspection of all curious to behold.

From the reign of Raamses to that of *Shishak*, cotemporary with Solomon and Rehoboam, scripture acquaints us with the name of no one of the Pharaohs; and from the death of Moses to the reign of Solomon, the Egyptian history is scarcely alluded to. We pass over, therefore, the space of time between the reign of those two kings, and come to consider the history of *Shishak*. It will be borne in mind, that Solomon "made affinity with Pharaoh, king of Egypt, married his daughter,"* and "built her a house" of great magnificence;† but notwithstanding the amity that existed between them, Shishak received Jereboam and protected him, when he fled from the presence of Solomon,‡ and the same king, "in the fifth year of Rehoboam, came up against Jerusalem with 60,000 horsemen, and footmen without number, captured the city, and pillaged the temple."§

From the brief account given by the sacred historian of this invasion, we are not able to learn the causes or particulars of it, and we can only *guess* at the former, and must remain ignorant of the latter, unless the hieroglyphics should make us acquainted with something more than we already possess. The most probable cause that can be suggested for the apparently strange conduct of Pharaoh Shishak, is indignation, that the seed of the princes of Egypt should be excluded from the throne of Israel. But from Manetho, and the hieroglyphics, we derive further light on this subject, and strong confirmation of the biblical account of it. The similarity between the שִׁשְׁק Shishok, or *Shishak*, of the Hebrew scriptures, Σουσάκις of the Septuagint, Σουσάκος of Josephus,|| *Secac* of the Vulgate, and Σέσονχης of Manetho, leaves no reasonable doubt of their identity; but that the *Sheshonk* of the monuments is the same as the *Shishak* of the bible, admits not of question. So too the chronology of Manetho and of the bible, as calculated by Dr. Hales, tend not less directly to the same conclusion.

* 1 Kings, iii. 1; vii. 8. † 1 Kings, vii. 8; 2 Chron. viii. 11. ‡ 1 Kings, xi. 41.
§ 1 Chron. xii. 47. || Antiq. 8, 102.

According to the historian of Egypt, Sesonchis, the first king of the 22d dynasty, began his reign 463 years before the time of Cambyses, and according to Dr. Hales, Solomon died 462 years before the time this king conquered Egypt.* If Manetho began the reign of Cambyses with his accession to the throne of Persia, then would Solomon and Shishak be cotemporaries six years; but, as is more probable, if he began it when Egypt was conquered by that king, then but one year.†

But the translation of the hieroglyphics confirms the account of the conquest of Judah in a manner most truly wonderful. On the temple of Karnac, Sheshonk is represented as presenting at the feet of the Theban trinity, the kings of more than thirty conquered nations, among whom is one with the features and lineaments of a Jew of the higher orders, who is representing as reigning on the "holy mountain," and inscribed, "JUDAH—AMALEK," *the king of Judah*. How exactly this describes Rehoboam, it is needless to point out. Proof more convincing on a question like this is impossible.‡

The next Egyptian king mentioned in scripture, (if true that he was king of Egypt, which has been often doubted,) was זֶרַח Zerah, called Zara in the Vulgate; Ζαράς in the LXX; and Ζαρασιός by Josephus.§ The doubt concerning the country over which Zerah reigned, has arisen from the appellation Æthiops, or Ethiopian, attached to his name by the sacred penman; but it does not appear whether this cognomen was given because he reigned over Ethiopia, or because he was an Ethiopian by birth, or because he had conquered that country. Zerah must have been successor to Shishak, and the king called by Manetho, Osoroth or Osorchon. Between Zerah and Osorchon, there does not seem to be any similarity, but if we drop the vowels in both words, and reject the "Egyptian terminal n," both words will exactly correspond, the *zrh* of the Hebrew comprising the same elementary sounds as the *srh* of the monuments.||

The territory of Zerah must have been immense, judging from the multitude that composed his army, viz. 1,000,300 chariots, and his invasion of Judah probably took place in the eleventh year of Asa, and of his own reign, or as Greppo supposes, in the fifteenth or last year of Zerah's reign.¶ The name of this king is not unfrequent on the colonnades of the Egyptian temples.

* Jahn, Calmet, and Greppo.

† Greppo, following the chronology of Usher, places Rehoboam's accession to the throne of Egypt, B. C. 971, erroneously printed on p. 119, 791, and supposes that Shishak's reign commenced the same year.

‡ Greppo, p. 2, c. 6; For. Quar. Rev. § Antiq. 8, 12, 1. || Greppo, p. 2, c. 6.

¶ Comp. 2 Chron. xiii. xiii. and xiv. and Manetho, in Jahn and Greppo, p. 2, c. 6.

Subsequent to the victory of Asa, by about 200 years, we are introduced to another Egyptian sovereign, the מֶסֶר of the Hebrew; Σωά or Σηγῶρ of the LXX; Σωα or Σωάν of Josephus;* the Sua, or Seve, of the Vulgate, and So of the English scriptures.†

Different opinions have been entertained as to the identity of *Soa*, or giving *vau* the sound of *v*, *Sova*, some supposing him to be the *Sabbaccon* of Manetho, the first king of the 25th dynasty, while others take him to have been his son and successor, *Sevechus*. The chronology of Manetho and Dr. Hales, confirms the latter supposition. Thus, from the eleventh year of Asa to the twelfth of Ahaz, when Hoshea began to reign over Israel, was 215 years; and from the eleventh year of Osorchon to the first year of *Sevechus*, was 210 years; consequently Hoshea began to reign over Israel in the fifth year of *Sevechus*; and his embassy to *So*, which probably took place in the sixth year of his reign, was in the eleventh year of the reign of the king of Egypt. The name *Sevekoteph*, which Champollion has found on monuments, seems to have been the same as *Sevechus*, and *So*.

A few years later, mention is made of a king of Ethiopia, as an ally of Hezekiah, king of Judea,‡ called in Hebrew תִּרְהַקָּה; in English, *Tirhakah*; the translators of the Septuagint reading the Hebrew without the aid of points, rendering it Θαρακά; which has also been followed by the Vulgate in *Tharaca*, while Josephus has Θαρακίης.§ Bare inspection must be sufficient to satisfy any one of the identity of this word with the *Taracus* of Manetho, and the *Tarak* of the Egyptian monuments. Though called in scripture “king of Ethiopia,” there is reason to believe, that he was also king of Egypt, the successor of *Sevechus*, the last king of the 25th, or Ethiopian dynasty. He is supposed to be the Ethiopian king, Ταρακω of *Strabo*.

We have now arrived at the time of Pharaoh Necho,|| co-temporary with Josiah, king of Judah, concerning whom much may be learned from profane history. The decline of Egyptian architecture, for some centuries before the reign of this king, renders the inscriptions, of which there are many, of much less value, and were it not so they would not be as highly prized, since they descend into the times of more authentic history. We shall, therefore, leave this king, as well as הֹפְרָא *Hophra*; Οὐαφρή of the Septuagint; *Ephra* of the Vulgate;¶ for the consideration of those whose business it is to collate all the evidence contained in the various histories of that period,—a work in fact which has been already well done by Prideaux, in his *Collections*, and by others who have written on the same subject,—with this single re-

* Antiq. 9, 14, 1.

† 2 Kings, xvii.

‡ 2 Kings, xviii and xix.

§ Antiq. 10, 1, 4.

|| 2 Kings, xxiii; 2 Chron. xxxv.

¶ Jer. xiv. xxx.

mark, that the *Hophra* of the bible seems to be the same as the *Vaphria* of Manetho, whose name has been found on many monuments.

There is also a striking correspondence between many of the mythological notions of the Egyptians and the theology of the Jews; resemblances too of such a nature as to render it evident, that the former are but distorted and disfigured copies of the latter; but these also we must leave unnoticed, as not being within the scope of this article.

We learn, then, from the study of Egyptian antiquities, especially that portion obtained from a translation of the hieroglyphics, that the allusions, direct and incidental, made by the Jewish scriptures, to the customs, manners, and history of the Egyptians, are most fully substantiated by the authentic records of that country. We learn too, from this study, that though, as Beaufort, Niebuhr, and others* have shown, the early history of Greece and Rome is entitled to no credit whatever; yet the historical details of the Pentateuch, though remounting a thousand years earlier, are most unquestionably true. And such we doubt not will always be the case with every authentic document on this early period.

We cannot close these few remarks, therefore, without urging upon our readers, and especially the clerical portion of them, the importance of making themselves acquainted with the situation and history, the customs and manners, the religion and laws, of those nations cotemporary with the Jewish, as directly tending not only to illustrate and explain many dark passages in the history of the Jewish church, but also as furnishing a complete demonstration of the superiority and certainty of the one over and above every other.

ART. II.—JOHN WESLEY ON THE 'WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.'

SCEPTICISM and mysticism are two extremes between which lies the path of pure religion; and whoever inclines to either, leaves the way which the true light illuminates, and passes into the region of clouds. Objects around him become indistinct, leaving nothing clearly perceptible but their shadowy outlines; his failing vision grows more dim; his difficulties thicken and become more frightful, until surrounded by the most gloomy and impenetrable clouds and darkness, he "stumbles upon the dark mountains." We do not say, that these extremes are equally fearful. We do not

* Beaufort, *Sur l'Incertitude de l'histoire Romaine*; Niebuhr, *Hist. Rome*; Richardson's *Diss. in Pers. Dict*; Bryant's *Ancient Mythology*; *Rev. of Wolf's Prog. Walsh*, Am. Q. Rev. By Dr. Cooper. Dr. C. includes all history before the days of Herodotus, but the Jewish and Egyptian we have seen are exceptions to his sweeping denunciation.

say, that they shed the same desolation upon the heart. This is not the case. They differ as the shadowy charm of a bewildering dream differs from the horrors of a desolating tempest. Scepticism, or philosophic impiety, is necessarily fiendlike, and by a law of its nature moves with a stern and impious recklessness. But while the sceptic embarks in the enterprise of hostility to all religion, and arms himself against God and conscience, there is something in mysticism, which, though wild and extravagant, is nevertheless often splendidly so;—something that is not in the same manner repulsive, because it does not appear in the same impious garb and temper. The mystic is an ardent votary of religion, who lacks that inestimable requisite to christian experience which the apostle calls a "sound mind." He is wrought up to the belief, that he possesses a sort of inspiration, and his reason is trammelled, perhaps overborne, by the flow of imaginative emotions. In short the blood that circulates in the arteries of scepticism, is frightfully black and cold, and is altogether different from that which gives life to the mystic, whose character usually combines much moral excellence and self-denying devotion with the exhalations of a distempered mind.

Mysticism* presents a great diversity of shades, from the soft and beautiful colorings in which it enchanted the mind of Fenelon to the wild ravings of Swedenborg. Many excellent and useful men have been found among its votaries, and, in some of its forms, it is eminently contagious. When the soil is properly fitted it flourishes with great luxuriance. Perhaps this is to be accounted for chiefly by the fact, that men are naturally and strongly inclined to abuse their intuitive perception of the soul's immortality and of a spiritual world, by seeking familiarity with the supernatural and spiritual through the medium of sensible images; thus sensualizing the spiritual, and in religion changing christian experience into supernatural influxes of feeling, or palpable communication with the Divinity. However it may be accounted for, few mental diseases are more contagious, or more fondly harbored than this, wherever it spreads. It steals into the mind like a spirit of fascination, trans-

* M. Victor Cousin furnishes a brief analysis of mysticism in the fourth lecture of his "*Cours de l'Histoire de la Philosophie.*" Some of the best things in his "*Cours*" are contained in the twelve first lectures, which have not yet won the honors of translation. He says of mysticism,—

"Le mysticisme n'est pas autre chose qu'un acte de désespoir de la raison humaine, qui, forcée de renoncer au dogmatisme, et ne pouvant se résigner au scepticisme, ne voulant pas non plus abjurer son indépendance, tente une sorte de compromise entre l'inspiration religieuse et la philosophie."

However backward any of Cousin's readers may be to receive some of the peculiarities of his philosophy, all will concede to him, not only great abilities and various learning, but a reverence for christianity, which secures him against any thrust that can be intended when his name is associated with "*the infidel philosophers of France and Germany.*"

muting its imaginations into realities, and the glow of nervous excitement into the ecstasy of inspiration. In its more sober forms, especially, its power to beguile is wonderful, and wherever it secures dominion it acts like a bewildering spell.

Perhaps there never was a man in the slightest degree infected with mysticism, who was farther removed from dreamy quietism, or who was more truly and extensively useful than John Wesley. Probably the only way to gain an accurate view of the peculiarities of his mind and character, as well as of the influences that tended to make him what he was, is to read his journals in connection with the memoirs of his parents, particularly of his mother. None of his biographers have quite succeeded. We do not see the man precisely as he was, in Southey. He appears more naturally in his life by Watson, which, upon the whole, is one of the best that has appeared. But to contemplate him through a medium that is perfectly clear and colorless, we must look into his journals. There we see John Wesley. There we may survey the mechanism of his character and trace its progress through all its stages. There we find the true expression of its peculiar elements,—the insane as well as the sane,—the wild and extravagant as well as the correct and pure. They contain a record of his superstition, his mysticism, his living piety, his holy life, his tireless labors to save men, his sufferings from persecution, his unshaken steadfastness in his work until he went “up higher” to stand before the throne. Far be it from us to speak of Mr. Wesley without suitable feelings of respect. He was a highly distinguished servant of God, whose glory no human efforts can tarnish, and if we could we would not pluck a leaf from the crown that laurels his brow. We regard him as a luminary of uncommon brightness, whose shining gladdened the church, and whose splendor still lingers upon its path. His name is enrolled with those worthies whose destiny is to shine forever in the kingdom of heaven with the brightness of the firmament. But while we eulogize, we cannot be insensible of the fact, that this luminary was not perfectly unclouded. There were spots upon it, which enthusiastic admiration may easily overlook, but which the unjaundiced eye of a candid christian spectator may detect and expose without the least diminution of merited respect.

We design in this article briefly to notice his sermons* on the “Witness of the Spirit.” In describing the evidences of regeneration, he makes two kinds, namely, the witness of the Divine Spirit and the witness of our own spirit. By the latter, he means our consciousness of possessing “the fruits of the Spirit,” or holy ex-

* These sermons will be found in the New-York edition of his works, vol. i. pp. 85-108.

ercises, and this he makes secondary. The former he sets forth as the primary and great witness,—the *sine qua non* of regeneration, and of this he treats in these sermons, in which he unfolds the sentiment we propose to examine; a sentiment the influence of which may be traced in the character of Methodism every where, from the period when Wesley landed in England, on his return from Georgia, to the present time. It is his mysticism; and our first object will be to give our readers a distinct view of the sentiment as he has stated it.

In the first place then, what does he mean by it? He describes it as a real impression. Thus he says:

'The testimony of the Spirit is *an inward IMPRESSION on the soul*, whereby the Spirit of God *directly witnesses* to my spirit, that I am a child of God; that Jesus hath loved me and given himself for me, and that all my sins are blotted out, and that I, even I, am reconciled to God.'

Observe, it is not only an impression, but an impression that brings intelligence from heaven and distinctly communicates it. In other words, it is strictly a divine *revelation*. This is not a loose paragraph which carelessly dropped from his pen. It was not set down in haste. Twenty years after it was written, he referred to it in the second of these sermons, and remarked, "I see no cause to retract any part of this. Neither do I see how any of these expressions may be altered so as to make them more intelligible." Therefore it was with him a matter of deliberate doctrine, that every regenerated sinner receives the assurance of pardon and adoption by means of direct revelation from heaven, in conveying which the Holy Spirit communicates with the soul in sensible approaches or impressions.*

2. Another peculiarity in Mr. Wesley's views, is, that the impression commences and is felt before the commencement of holiness in the sinner's character. It comes in that previous renewal of the heart which must take place before there can be holiness of life,—which is the indispensable pre-requisite, the real and only fountain of holy exercises. But let him speak for himself:

'We must love God before we can be holy at all, this being the root of all holiness. Now we cannot love God, till we know he loves us:

* Indeed Mr. Wesley did not hesitate to call these communications of the Spirit *revelations*. See the first part of his "Lecture to one who had lately joined the Quakers." In his note on Rom. viii. 16, Dr. A. Clarke says, "and the knowledge of this adoption cannot be given by any human or earthly means; it must come from God himself." In other words, there is no way in which a converted sinner can be assured of his conversion but by direct revelation. The evidence furnished in the bible is of no avail. Faith and consciousness avail nothing. He will be ignorant of the fact, unless it be directly revealed to him from above.

we love him because he first loves [loved] us; and we cannot know his love to us, till his Spirit witnesses it to our spirit. Till then we cannot believe it.'

What! cannot love God,—cannot know,—cannot believe the love of God until visited by inspiration,—until we receive a new revelation of it! What unsophisticated man can read his bible and believe it impossible to love God without such a visitation, or that loving God is not holiness! But, to understand this mystical language, it must be borne in mind, that Wesley's views of regeneration included much of what is known as the *taste*-scheme. Did it come within our present design to enter into this discussion, it might be profitable to make a minute examination into the theories and language of our Methodist brethren on this subject.

3. We note a third characteristic of this impression. It possesses certain *criteria* by which its divinity is instantaneously, mysteriously, and infallibly demonstrated. Let our readers weigh the following language:

'Suppose God were now to speak to any soul, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," he must be willing that soul should know his voice; otherwise he would speak in vain. And he is able to effect this; for whenever he wills, to do is present with him. And he does effect it; that soul is ABSOLUTELY assured "this is the voice of God."'

Nor is this all. The subjects of these communications are shielded against the importunities of doubt by the plea, that the thing is inexplicable and they can give no account of it. Thus he says:

'To require a minute and philosophical account of the intrinsic marks whereby we know the voice of God, is to make a demand which can never be answered; no, not by one who has the deepest knowledge of God.'

That no invention of human philosophy can explain the mode of the Holy Spirit's operation, all must agree, who concur with the bible or the convictions of a sane mind. But observe, what he describes as incomprehensible, is not *how* the Spirit acts upon the soul. He has already explained this to be by an "impression," a "voice." The only thing inexplicable is, that intrinsic something by which the divine voice is at once and infallibly distinguished from every thing false and delusive.

4. Except in one circumstance, his view of these special revelations is identical with that of the Quakers, and most other mystics of a similar cast. In the office he assigns to the "witness of our own spirits," he differs from the Quakers. Barclay maintains, that the influxes of "Immediate revelation" are the primary guide; and being above the bible cannot be subject to any test.

Wesley professes to have furnished a test by which to determine whether they are genuine. He directs those who profess to have heard the voice of God, to look to the "fruits." If it is not immediately succeeded by the witness of their own spirit, or the consciousness of possessing christian graces, they are deluded. It is a fatal objection to his test, that, when the fruits do follow, its power to detect delusion is gone. If true piety is discovered, no matter how much delusion is blended therewith, the test has no authority to proclaim, that all is not well. After investing the "witness of the Spirit" with intrinsic marks by which its divine character is infallibly known, it was with a strange inconsistency, although doubtless under the influence of a much more sober and sounder view of christian character, that he differed from the Quakers concerning the test. The test is wholly superfluous, for why should there be an appeal to fruit, if the man to whom the Spirit speaks "is absolutely assured, 'this is the voice of God?'" In such a case he *cannot* be mistaken, and what need has he of more evidence? Barclay is the more consistent of the two, for, if a man receives a revelation that itself contains indubitable evidence of being from God, how dare he doubt and subject it to a test? Mr. Wesley's appeal to the fruits, however, unquestionably contributed to save him from quietism, and to promote the excellence and untiring activity of his zeal.

We now propose to make a few remarks upon the fanciful nature and evil tendencies of this doctrine.

1. This doctrine of impressions must be regarded as an unwarranted fancy of mysticism. There are "evidences of regeneration," and it is certain, that every converted man may be assured of his conversion. Or rather, regeneration, the change wrought, evidences itself,—it is a matter of consciousness; and to talk of its "evidences," as something apart and distinct from its nature, is to use language without precision. If regeneration takes place in our hearts, we are capable of perceiving it, just as we perceive every other change in character. Our exercises are the offspring, not of an indefinable "gracious ability," but of our moral agency: we produce them voluntarily; of course they come under our notice, and we may have a distinct and accurate consciousness of our moral state. And surely no christian can know himself too accurately, or guard his character with too much vigilance. But, in arriving at a knowledge of his state, it is of the first consequence for him to know, that by exciting his feelings and analyzing his impulses, he will not only retard his progress, but blind and delude himself. His great inquiry should be, "Have I a christian temper? Have I ceased to do evil, and learned to do well?" *How* the Holy Spirit proceeds in the work of regeneration, he cannot tell. *How* this divine agent operates in producing and sustaining

the christian graces, he cannot say,—he does not know. The scriptures do not warrant him in going beyond the bare fact, that *it is so*; and doubtless the human mind is at present unable to go farther. Therefore any attempt to explain this point by employing sensible images and talking of impressions and voices, is to open a path that leads astray,—is to surround christian experience with a distempered atmosphere; is, in fine, to subject ourselves to the folly and extravagance invariably attendant upon attempts to be “wise above what is written.”

It was this attempt at explanation, that produced the doctrine of these sermons. The text on which they are founded is, “The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.” Rom. viii. 16. But this text certainly does not contain the doctrine developed in the sermons. Every attentive reader will mark a peculiarity in some of the language of this chapter, and especially in those connections in which the phrase, “the Spirit,” is employed. Yet, however these connections may be understood, nothing but the perversion which a wild philosophy sometimes bestows upon the bible, can find the doctrine of impressions there. The 16th verse merely states a fact; while Wesley unfolds and defends his theory as that fact. The apostle simply says, “the Spirit beareth witness;” but these sermons undertake to furnish an exact view of the *mode* of operation. The fault then consists in an attempt to transmute a theory into a doctrine; to weave the explanation into his “standard,” and thus enforce belief in it, as a leading article in christian theology. It is the same fault as that spirit of theorizing, which, under various forms and from various motives, plunges into the deep things of God to seek **THE HOW, THE MODE**, where revelation has withheld it, and impose its speculations upon the world as the only wisdom,—essential doctrines. In the variety of its operations, how has this spirit troubled the church! How will it trouble the church until every man of God gives himself to fasting and prayer, that it may be cast out! It is this, far more than any thing else whatever, that has kindled and sustains in this country, those controversial agitations which are threatening to desolate one of the fairest portions of God’s vineyard, with the convulsions, the ruins, the frightful show of a battlefield. It is this, that has furnished the spectacle of brethren,—and brethren too of the same communion,—excited from discussion to combat, about the how and why sin exists under the divine government, or the posterity of Adam are sinners in consequence of his sin. There is no book we would sooner hail, or with more gladness, than a faithful history of the operations of this spirit in all ages; in which the writer, discriminating between the theory and doctrine, should furnish a clear view of the fortunes of christian doctrine, and exhibit all the de-

partures from its purity which theorizing has occasioned. He who shall write such a book, will do christianity a most valuable service.

Pure, unwarranted theorizing, as Wesley's account of "the witness of the Spirit" is, we are not saying, that he was led into it by a love of curious and idle speculation. We are far from saying so, for we do not believe it. He was no deliberate trifler. He did not devote himself to religion either purely or chiefly as a theme of curious philosophizing; indeed that sympathy with a set of opinions, which commonly brings forth blind and virulent dogmatism, is never of this kind; and a devoted mystic necessarily embraces the great principles of his creed with religious fervor. In this way Wesley adopted his view on this subject; and its peculiar nature is such, that no speculating *bad* man is in danger of tending to it, through the influence of *his* philosophy. Whatever may be the case afterwards, in the first instance none but good men are liable to fall into errors like this; and the good have erred here, commencing with slight departures from harmonious christian character, with bringing small portions of strange fire into the temple of God, and often consummating the evil by a wreck of all that is "lovely and of good report." To those who presume, that there is no danger in rising at least so far above the bible and reason, as to place implicit confidence in this theory of special revelations, we would say, beware! Should they still persist in the presumption, from among the various monitory examples recorded in the annals of christianity, we would select the case of Edward Irving, and urge them to consider it with the closest scrutiny and be satisfied, that when christian experience is seduced into the land of dreams and fervid extravagance, there is danger of its being fearfully wrecked.

2. The doctrine of these sermons is the same in *principle* with every extravagance of the wildest and most ardent form of mysticism. There is no account of a voice, or appearance, or vision, or revelation, on the annals of enthusiasm, which may not be vindicated in the same way in which Mr. Wesley vindicates this theory of impressions. It will be recollected, that he describes the impression as attended with infallible *criteria* of its divinity, which instantly convince the subject of the communication, although he can give no explanation to another. Of course, while he is truly religious, no one has a right to question the correctness of such a man's account of his revelations from heaven. Here then is an open door for every thing in enthusiasm that is lawless. No matter how preposterous, how amazing, how incredibly monstrous may be the enthusiast's account of his visions and voices, he is intrenched, and no expostulation can exorcise the insanity, no reasoning can reach him. His case is above argument, and reason must do nothing but humbly sit and stare at the thing in

stupified astonishment. By the inexplicable *criteria* the enthusiast is "absolutely assured," that his revelations are divine, and that he labors under no delusion. Mr. Wesley's test, as we have seen, does not meet the difficulty, for it has no power to quell the fervors of this extravagance, unless they are joined with positive wickedness. If the "fruits" follow, the account of a divine afflatus cannot be questioned. Now that a good man should become an enthusiast, is by no means a strange supposition. At least it will not appear such to those who understand the tendencies of the human mind, or who are acquainted with the character and career of Mr. Wesley and others. How then, upon his principles, shall the evil be dislodged from the mind of a man who is undoubtedly pious? What means shall be employed to purge those currents of religious experience where the "gravel and the gold roll together?" How shall we convince the truly religious enthusiast, that the "impressions" and "visions" in which he fancies that he realizes "*sensible* communion" with heaven, are nothing but the tumults of nervous sensation and the vagaries of a morbid imagination? Consciousness can determine nothing but the quality of our exercises and character; and according to Mr. Wesley's showing, does not make it possible to correct delusion in the circumstances which we have supposed. We will state a case in point,—one which fell under our own observation. We refer to the case of a lady who formerly resided in one of the country towns of New-England. She had been educated in a family, and under the influence of a small religious society, where the prevailing spirit was exceedingly deficient in point of intelligence, but warm with the glow of enthusiasm, and somewhat affected with a dash of its wildness, and had nearly arrived at middle life without becoming pious, when a revival prevailed in her neighborhood. From the commencement of the revival she professed anxiety; and, as she was at the time considerably indisposed and her imagination extremely morbid, many of her exercises were peculiar. Her solicitude continued about ten days, when she professed to have met with a change, and to be filled with the joy of hope by means of an astonishing vision. She stated, that near the middle of the night, as she lay in bed pondering her case, her room was suddenly illuminated and she heard a voice addressing her "in tones more ravishing than any music that ever was heard." The light resembled her conceptions of a glory and continued to fill the room during about five minutes, and these words were thrice repeated: "Thy sins are forgiven thee, go and sin no more." As the sound of the voice died away the light vanished; "but," said she, "my burden was gone and I was happy,—almost too happy to live. At intervals, I seemed to hear the singing of angels. My strength failed me. I could take no note of time. How long I

lay thus I cannot tell. At length I revived as from a trance and sung so loud as to awaken the family. We all arose and I told them what the Lord had done for me."

Now we do not suppose an intelligent Methodist will contend, that such cases contain nothing wrong and alien to pure religion. We doubt not that bishop Soule, or Dr. Bangs, or Dr. Fisk, would censure the wrong with proper discrimination and severity. But still we ask, how can a true disciple of Wesley, upon his principles, show that this case is not one of the decisive "witness of the Spirit"? How will he detect the delusion and separate it from the true and pure? He cannot do it by an appeal to the subsequent state of the character,—to the life. Such a trial of the case we have related, would accomplish nothing but its vindication, for the subsequent life of this lady was irreproachable. She united herself with the church where she resided, and until her death was one of its most devotedly pious members. The "witness of her own spirit," therefore is decidedly in her favor. Reason and a sound mind would contend, that this lady was truly converted, inasmuch as from that hour she led a new life; and they would say, the extravagancies resulted from the three following causes, viz: the want of an unclouded and distinct knowledge of the nature of religion, the influence of a nervous disease, and the action of a diseased imagination. But to this she could reply, as in the language of these sermons, 'I am not deluded. I know that the light and voice were from God. I had an instantaneous and absolute assurance of it on their first appearance. I cannot explain how I knew it. I cannot describe the intrinsic evidences that gave me this assurance, nor have you a right to question me concerning them. Yet I know the vision to have been real and divine, as certainly as I know my own existence.' And who, that strictly adheres to Mr. Wesley's doctrine of the special revelation of pardon and adoption, can gainsay this answer. If such a reply is unanswerable in the mouth of a truly converted man, who believes that such a revelation has been made him by means of an impression,—why is it not unanswerable in this case? No man will presume to doubt, that innumerable modes of manifestation are possible to God, any one of which can be employed when his wisdom pleases. The question is not what he *can* do, but what is the fact: and where the belief in revelations by impressions is held, how can it be doubted, that he sometimes reveals himself in dazzling light, and announces the sinner's pardon in an audible voice, in tones sweeter and richer than any earthly melody? When working miracles in attestation of the divine origin of christianity, Christ revealed himself to Saul of Tarsus in a manner similar to this. But such a mode is no more miraculous than that for which Mr. Wesley contends, and if one man claims to have received intelli-

gence from heaven by means of an impression, why may not another claim to have received similar communications in a vision like that which appeared to Saul when journeying to Damascus, or that which Peter saw when he fell down in a trance and was directed to preach the gospel to the Gentiles? This consideration alone is sufficient to render the true nature of Mr. Wesley's doctrine perfectly obvious; and we repeat it, it is that germ which, in a favorable soil and with proper culture, would flourish luxuriantly and bring forth all the fruits of the wildest mysticism. Nor has it been without its influence, as the history of Methodism amply shows. Without going further, it would be easy to illustrate its tendency by considering the accounts of religious experience which we sometimes meet with in Methodist biographies and papers, or by referring to scenes which not unfrequently occur at Methodist camp-meetings.

3. We may notice another evil tendency of the doctrine of these sermons. It tends to destroy the healthy action of christian character, by creating an intemperate and all-absorbing demand for feeling and excitement.

Christian character, to be correct, must be exactly proportioned. Religion is adapted to our whole nature, and is designed to cultivate the whole without giving an undue prominence to any part of it,—to cultivate its intellect and its sensibilities,—its thoughts and its feelings,—and to train us for the holiness and happiness of heaven. Human nature is a glorious harp, capable of yielding music as rich as that which gladdens Paradise; but christianity finds it out of order and perverted to degrading services, and it aims to tune it and completely fit it for its appropriate use. That this object may be accomplished, our religion must be not all speculation, or all sentiment, or all outward merely. It must be all these together, and each in its due proportion. Every string of the harp must be tuned with the most careful exactness. Of course to be religious we must have feeling, just as certainly as there must be undulations of the air in producing music. But the true feelings of religion spring not from direct efforts to produce them; they are the result of the proper cultivation of human nature, and to make them the primary object of attention is to commit a wrong that will derange the proportion of christian character. That Mr. Wesley's doctrine of impressions is calculated to give the feelings a dangerous prominence, follows as a direct consequence of their being made a principal test of religion. As the great evidence of regeneration, they become the object of perpetual solicitude, and by this means the attention will be drawn off from things whose importance should be viewed as paramount. Self-examination will become a study of frames and impressions, and these will be subjected to perpetual examination,

and dissected in every possible form, while the weightier matters are treated as secondary or entirely forgotten.

An immediate consequence of this solicitude about feeling, will be the derangement and desolation of genuine religious sensibility. There is a wide difference between true and false sensibility, which every one professes to understand, and the distinction is no where so broad as in religion. That religious sensibility may be pure, it must be consistent. It must not pour itself out to excess in one direction, and be deficient in another. If it be directed chiefly to one point, insensibility will collect around every other point, and the character will be distempered. Religion fills the soul with a joy that is deep and sublime. It gives the character a chastened enthusiasm, a quenchless ardor, a sublime earnestness. It has its seat in the heart. But pure religion creates no disproportion; for it is perfectly symmetrical, and whatever tends to produce excessive anxiety about feeling, is alien to it because it destroys symmetry and operates to degrade sensibility into sentimentalism. The religious sentimentalist will study his feelings as a duty of the highest and most indispensable importance, and we may sometimes hear him talk of his "glorious meetings," and "precious seasons," when it is obvious that he possesses very little of the sensibility which the unobstructed operation of religious principle awakens; and when the chief ingredient in the rapture of the "precious seasons," upon which he lays so much stress, is plainly nothing but animal excitement, and of course is purely sensuous. Whether practical religion reigns in his character,—whether he is steadfast in fulfilling all the ministries of benevolence,—whether he is faithful in discharging all the duties that grow out of his relations in life, are with him secondary and comparatively trivial considerations. Calm and rational contemplation,—unyielding obedience to principle,—the carrying of religion into all the scenes of real life,—intelligent moral culture,—these are things which he cannot properly appreciate. He regards them as not to be named in comparison with one "precious season." The great thing, that which in his views transcends every thing else, is feeling. The importunate cry of his solicitude, is, "*give me feeling, give me feeling, or I die.*" Such a man will not deny the importance of religious practice. Perhaps he is unconscious of being wanting in a just estimation of it. But you can see the nature of his malady in the form and direction of his solicitude. The importance he attaches to feeling and excitement is every where manifest. His chief inquiry is about these when he forms an estimate of the religion of others. The state of religious tempers and practice interest him far less than the fervors of excitement; and he approves or condemns according as these do or do not accord with his opinion of what should be. For

himself, he cannot live without them. He must have the gush of excitement in his soul. He must have that delicious rapture of sentimentalism pour and glow through his nervous system, which comes as readily in the thrill of a lovely song, or in waves of music from a skilfully played instrument, as in the sing-song cadences of the most perfectly chanted rhapsody. But this is not true religious sensibility; and every man capable of reading his bible and studying the constitution of his being, may know that it is not. It is poison, and unless removed by the proper remedies will steal into every part of christian character, inflaming and maddening. It is strange fire, and unless promptly quenched will leave scathing and desolation upon the soul. How vigilantly, then, should every christian guard himself, and, as he aims to cultivate the true sensibility and excitement of religion, instantly repress and spurn every thing that would disturb the symmetry of his character.

By deranging the true sensibility of religion, this insatiable "hungering and thirsting" after feeling, produces that fitful religion which has been very expressively termed *spasmodic*,—a form of religion which is of course chiefly the product of a nervous and imaginative temperament,—and whose leading characteristics are to increase in proportion as excitement grows more intense, and to be as fitful in its changes as the temperature of the atmosphere. Such religion is grievous; and one of the chief anxieties of a careful pastor, will be to secure uniformity and permanence in the religious affections and zeal of his church; and to promote this, he will apply himself to detect and remove every obstruction, and to heal all the maladies in the zeal of his church. He will carefully inculcate clear views of what religion really is, and teach his people to discriminate between the true and the false. How often will such a pastor find it necessary to show, that religious affections differ widely from sentimentalism,—that the purest religion does not always produce the most noisy agitations,—that the most beautiful and expressive emblem of christian character is not the furious torrent that pours down the mountain side, scattering foam and thunder along its track, but the calm, ever flowing river, which moves along in comparative silence, communicating fertility to the soil and loveliness to the landscape, mirroring the sky, and perpetually receiving accessions to its waters, until it rolls its broad tide into the ocean. And in the midst of his endeavors, how often will he see fair appearances pass away like morning mist, and be constrained to weep and pray over the state of his people in secret, and remember the language of God concerning the Israelites: "Oh, that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me and keep all my commandments always!" But should he go to his people with the doctrine of these sermons, and teach them to cultivate impressions as the leading evidence of

their justification, the evil will not fail to increase; for such instruction will produce it where it does not exist, and make it flourish where it does. It sets up a factitious standard. Teach a man, that in determining whether he is converted he must rely on frames and sallies of feeling,—teach him to regard these as the life and soul of religion,—teach him that he “falls from grace” just as often as he loses them, and, if he practises accordingly, how soon will his religion resemble the mercury in a thermometer, and change with the temperature of feeling, now elevated above fever heat, and anon standing many degrees below zero! The influence of such teaching will impel him to a continual dissection of feeling, and in consequence the ebb and flow of the nervous system will be resolved into religious affections, and the charlatanism of enthusiasm into the action of religious zeal.

There is another aspect of the evil. Every philosophical observer, who examines with the scriptures before him, fails not to perceive, that whatever contributes to promote fitfulness in religion, promotes declension and insensibility. Indeed, this is so obvious as scarcely to require to be dwelt on. The declension follows on the principle of reaction. When we see a swollen torrent in the spring rushing and roaring onward, and afterwards, when summer comes, find its channel dry, we know how to account for it; or when we see a mountain wave dash in fury and foam upon the shore, roll far up the beach, and then subside, we all understand what it means. So in the moral world, every form of wrong and tumultuous excitement, contains the elements of reaction in all their life and vigor; and when a man is brought to believe, that he cannot be religious without a certain amount of nervous sensation, it is but natural that his devotion should decline just as often, and in the same proportion as the sensation subsides. The glow of animal excitement which is mingled with his religion, from its nature, cannot be otherwise than transitory; and when it expires, he believes his religion has departed; and influenced by this persuasion, he gives it up and yields himself to the full power of declension and insensibility. So it will be in a church, if a similar excitement steals into it. Now the excitement of religion is not necessarily spasmodic and transient; it requires to become permanent, and it will become so, if sustained with fidelity and carefully guarded against the disturbing forces and fires of wild enthusiasm. We sometimes hear the complaint, that the effects of a revival have been in a great part temporary, and even in some cases, that it has been succeeded by a strange coldness. Other causes may have produced this state of things, but it is of the utmost importance in such cases to know how far the revival suffered from the evil in question. Faithful inquiry will seldom fail to discover, that in a great measure the declension results as the reac-

tion of distempered excitement. Let religious affections be kindled by nothing but the Holy Spirit working in his wisdom and power; let religious zeal be pure, intelligent, guided by principle, and unswerving in its action; let the churches be "steadfast and unmovable" in righteousness, and it will not be necessary to promote religion in the world by means of revivals; or rather, religion will be promoted by means of a wide-spread, extending, inextinguishable revival, which burns with nothing but celestial fire sent down from heaven, and which will perpetually advance until the earth is filled with holiness, and all nations hail the endless sabbath; until the hearts of men are mingled together in peace and good will, and the day arrives when Cowper's language shall become reality:

'One song employs all nations,—and all cry,
 "Worthy the Lamb, for he was slain for us!"
 The dwellers in the vales and on the rocks
 Shout to each other, and the mountain tops
 From distant mountains catch the flying joy;
 Till,—nation after nation taught the strain,—
 Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round.'

We have approached a point of thrilling interest; but as we have not proposed to discuss it in this paper, we will not enter upon it. We will not dismiss it however without commending it to the attention of every pastor in the land. Oh, could our voice peal through the churches and ring in the heart of every christian, we would say: "Men of God, be of sound minds; be guided by heavenly wisdom; keep yourselves unspotted, and in every thing take heed to your ways!"

In taking our leave of Mr. Wesley's sermons, we repeat it, that while we differ from him and deprecate the tendency of his views of the 'witness of the Spirit,' we admire the excellences of his character. Therefore we demand to be heard with candor. We say this, because hitherto our Methodist brethren have shown a morbid sensitiveness whenever their favorite writers have been reviewed, or their favorite doctrines controverted. We would remind them, that, astonishing as it may seem in their eyes, we have no more faith in their infallibility than in that of the pope; and when their theology passes into what some philosophers have called the second moments of thought, perhaps they will become a little less dogmatical, and at least permit it to be made a question, whether it does not contain some error. When that time arrives, we invite them to re-peruse our remarks, and subject the sentiment we have examined to a rigorous analysis. Meanwhile we suggest the propriety of a little meditation upon the following aphorism of the great English philosopher: "*Idola et notiones falsæ, quæ intellectum humanum jam occuparent, atque in eo alte hærent,*

non solum mentes hominum ita obsident, ut veritati aditus difficilis pateat; sed etiam dato et concesso aditu, illa rursus in ipsa instauratione scientiarum occurrent, et molesta erunt; nisi homines præmoniti, adversus eas se, quantum fieri potest, muniant."

ART. III.—ON THE CHERUBIM OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

The Cherubim that guarded the way of the tree of life. Gen. iii. 24.

THE remarkable nature of the statement respecting the guard that was stationed (Gen. iii. 24.) to prevent men from partaking of the tree of life, and the difficulty of the passage itself, will justify an effort to offer an explanation. The statement is the following: "And he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubims and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." This statement is in itself very obscure, and has given rise to many unfounded opinions. "The common notion," says Faber, "that they were a sort of terrific scare-crows, employed to prevent mankind from approaching the tree of life, seems to me to be no less childish than irreconcilable with other parts of scripture."

The word which is rendered cherubim, כְּרֻבִים in the singular כְּרֻב *cherub*, occurs frequently in the sacred scriptures. Its derivation is, however, unknown. Gesenius supposes that it is derived from the Syriac ܟܪܒܝܐ *cherubi*, *potens, magnus, fortis*; strong, great, mighty. The translators of the Septuagint have not attempted to translate the word, but retain the Hebrew word in Greek letters, χερουβιμ. The Syriac, (Gen. iii. 24.) retains the same word ܟܪܒܝܐ *cherubo*. The Targum of Onkelos, also retains the same word. The Arabic renders it by the word *angels*, and evidently supposes, that *angels* were there stationed. Probably this is the most common supposition.

In order to ascertain the sense of the term here used, and the idea which Moses intended to convey, it may be useful to trace the *history* of the *cherub*, and its various forms as it appears in the sacred writers. We shall find it presented in the following instances: 1. In the guard that was placed at the east of Eden. 2. In the figures inwrought in the tapestry, or veil, of the ark and temple. 3. In the figures that were made over the ark of the covenant, in the tabernacle, and subsequently in the temple of Solomon. 4. In the temple described by Ezekiel, (Ch. xli. 18.) 5. In the description of Ezekiel as seen by the river Chebar, (Ezek. i. 10; x. 14.) 6. As seen in the clouds supporting God, and the emblem of his magnificence, and grandeur, and majesty, and the rapidity of his movements, (Ps. xviii. 11; 1 Sam. vi. 4;

2 Sam. vi. 2; Isaiah xxxvii. 16.) 7. In the traditions and representations of Josephus, and of oriental writers in general.

1. The first image, or form of the cherub, is that before us. Gen. iii. 24. All that here could be learned in regard to the form, figures, or design of the cherub, would be, (1.) that it guarded the entrance to Eden, and perhaps the part from which our first parents took their departure; retaining *materially* and *essentially* the idea, that a guard was placed, or that they were effectually secured from returning to the tree of life; (2.) that there was connected with the cherub a "flaming sword," *אֵת לַהֵט הַחֶרֶב* the flaming part, or blade of a sword, the part that *seemed* to glow, or to reflect the rays of the sun, as a polished sword does, Ps. civ. 4; lvii. 5. Probably, however, the word *sword* here is designed to be used figuratively, and to denote, that the cherubim *guarded* the way, as a *sword* is the instrument of defense, or of guarding any object. (3.) This flame, or sword, or defense, "turned every way," *הַמַּחֲסֵבָה* *Hammith haphecheth*, LXX. *στρογγυμένῃν*, constantly turning itself; to guard every avenue; to secure it faithfully and constantly. If the idea is that of *the sword*, it is that it had a power of *self-brandishing* in every direction, so as to secure the way from all access. If the idea is that of *the flame*, it is that of a fire *unfolding itself*; as a rolling fire or flame does. This idea as attached to the cherubim is conveyed in the view which Ezekiel had of the cherub by the river Chebar. Ezek. i. 4.

So far as this account goes when taken by itself, it might be applicable to a *real living being*, stationed there to guard the way; or to a fabulous being, wholly figurative; or to a *natural* object, as burning naphtha, bitumen; or a volcano; or to *any* thing that should constitute an effectual guard to the garden of Eden. Or possibly the idea may have arisen from an opinion which will soon be noticed, that the northern region was the rendezvous of the gods; the hills and mountains of Armenia, the place where they held their convocations, and where, beneath the splendor of the aurora borealis, as seen from a more southern latitude, it was supposed the gods usually assembled.

2. The next mention of the cherubim which it is proper to notice, is that which occurs in the direction given to Moses to form the "tabernacle with two curtains of fine-twined linen, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, *with* cherubim of cunning work." Ex. xxvi. 1, 31. From this it would appear, that the *figures* of the cherubim were inwrought into the veil, and the covering of the tabernacle; or that those figures were probably a mere pictorial representation of the cherubim that covered the ark of the covenant. As there is no mention of the form of the cherubim that were inwrought into the veil, and the covering of the

tabernacle, and as history gives us no well-authenticated description of their form, these passages do not aid us in ascertaining the idea which was couched under the word. Probably the only use of *this* picture on the veil and the covering of the tabernacle in preference to any other, was the design of presenting to the view of the people from without the tabernacle, a distinct impression of that which was so material an ornament, and intended to occupy so prominent a place within.

3. The third form in which the cherubim appear as claiming our notice, is in the golden figures which Moses was directed to make over the ark of the covenant in the tabernacle, and which were subsequently transferred in a more enlarged and magnificent form to the temple itself. These cherubim, or golden figures, are described in Ex. xxv. 18, 19; xxxvii. 7, 8; 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2, as applicable to the tabernacle; and in 1 Kings, vi. 23, 25, 26, 28; viii. 7; 2 Chron. v. 8; Heb. ix. 5, as applicable to the enlarged form of the cherubim in the temple. In this place, also, we may notice the form of the expression which occurs as applied to JEHOVAH, of his dwelling "*between* the cherubim," or rather, perhaps, his dwelling *above* the cherubim, since the word *between* is not in the Hebrew except in a single instance. Compare the following places: Ex. xxv. 22; Num. vii. 89; Ps. lxxx. 1; xcix. 1; Isa. xxxvii. 16; 2 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Kings, xix. 15.

The description of these figures as given by Moses, and as they existed in the tabernacle, is, that they were made of beaten gold; that one was placed at each end of the mercy-seat; that they were made with wings, and that these wings were stretched out on high so as to meet, and to cover the mercy-seat; and that their faces should look towards each other, and towards the mercy-seat. The mercy-seat was the golden cover of the ark; and from that place God said, that he would respond to his people, and commune with them from between these cherubim. Probably these were to be the symbols of the divine presence; and doubtless it was designed to be emblematic of the fact, that the Divine Being would speak in mercy to mankind. On this cover of the ark the blood of the atonement was sprinkled in the great day of expiation, and this is referred to distinctly as emblematic of the atonement, or propitiation of the Redeemer, by his own blood, in Rom. iii. 25. It is not without reason, that there has usually been thought to be a reference to this in the passage in 1 Pet. i. 12; "*Which things the angels desire to look into,*" *κατακύψαι*, *stoop down, bend down*, to examine. But this may be merely *language* drawn from the position of the figures in the tabernacle and temple, and not designed to intimate that the cherubim were *angels*,—which they certainly were not then,—or were represen-

tations of angels. They *may* indeed have been designed to represent the fact, that the angelic hosts were anxious to comprehend the work of redemption; no one can certainly deny this to be *possible*, and it is not declared that this was *not* the design. But neither is there any intimation, that this *was* the design, or that they had any reference either to the form, the purpose, or the desires of the angelic beings.

The figures of the cherubim made by Solomon, in the temple, were evidently of the same *form*, and with the same *design*, as those in the tabernacle. The difference was, that instead of being made with gold, they were made of the wood of the olive tree, and overlaid with gold. 1 Kings, vi. 23—28.

In regard to the *forms* and purposes of the cherubim in the temple, there have been many conjectures. Grotius supposes, that they were figures like a calf. Bochart and Spencer suppose, that they resembled an ox. Josephus says, that they were extraordinary creatures of a figure unknown to mankind; though he says, contrary to the author of 1 Kings, that even in the temple they were of solid gold. He also says, "that nobody can tell or even conjecture what was the shape of these cherubim." Ant. b. viii. ch. 3. § 3. This declaration of Josephus is a pretty certain intimation that the Jews had not even a *tradition* respecting their form, and perhaps an intimation no less certain, that all inquiries of men into their exact figure, must be in vain. As all conjectures on this subject must be useless, and as it is impossible to arrive at a satisfactory view of the form of the cherub, we may content ourselves with a reference to the articles of Taylor, the editor of Calmet's Dictionary, fragments No. CLII. and CCLXXXIII. and the *plates* in Calmet's Dictionary, Nos. 1—4, CHERUBIM.

All which it may be important to intimate here, is, that thus far in the scripture history,—that is to the time of the building of the temple of Solomon,—we have only the *name* cherubim with some very obscure intimations about their use; but that the *form* is carefully concealed. Whether it was the design of the sacred writers to *make* the subject obscure, or whether no description was given because the form was well known, are questions which cannot now be answered. We meet, however, with a remarkable development on this subject, in the

4. *Fourth* form presented to us by Ezekiel. Here the whole subject seems to be changed. The cherubim, instead of being undescribed in regard to its form, is portrayed with remarkable distinctness; becomes a living being; moves in the whirlwind, and is even transferred to the sky, and is made a most striking emblem of the divine majesty and glory. In order that this may be presented in a clearer and striking manner, we shall copy the description

of Ezekiel's cherubim from Herder's translation by Marsh, and then shall endeavor to ascertain its figure and object. Ezek. i. It may be proper to remark, that the whole subject of this vision is introduced by Ezekiel, (i. 1.) by saying, that it occurred during the time of the captivity, near the river of Chebar, (the *Chaboras*, a river of Assyria, that falls into the Euphrates in the upper part of Mesopotamia,) and thus he says, that "the heavens were opened, and he saw visions of God." From this it is evident, that the description was designed to represent scenes in heaven, and to be an emblematic description of God, and of the manner and purpose of his administration on earth.

'I looked, and lo ! a whirlwind from the North
 Came sweeping onward, a vast cloud, that rolled
 Its volumes, charged with gleaming fire, along,
 And cast its dazzling splendors all around.
 Now from within shone forth what seemed the glow
 Of gold and silver* molten in the flame,
 And in the midst thereof the form expressed,
 As of a four-fold living thing—a shape,
 That yet contained the semblance of a man.
 With four-fold visage each, and each four wings,
 On upright limbs and cloven feet they stood,
 And shone with splendor as of burnished brass.
 Withdrawn beneath their wings, on every side,
 Were human hands, for each four-sided seemed,
 And four-fold had their faces and their wings.
 Then, wing to wing, and each to each close joined,
 They turned not in their going, but went forth,
 Advancing each with look and course unchanged.
 In all the four-fold visage of the form was seen
 The face of man ; the right a lion, and an ox
 The left distinguished, and to all the four
 Belonged an eagle's visage. By itself
 Distinct, their faces and their wings they each
 Extended upward, joining thus it seemed,
 Two wings for flight, while two their bodies veiled.
 With course direct and forward each advanced,
 Whither the Spirit moved they went nor ever turned.
 The several living forms, like glowing coals
 Appeared. What seemed the flame of torches played
 Between them, and the dazzling light of fire.
 From out the fire went gleaming lightnings forth ;
 And quick, as lightning's flash, the living forms
 Were here and there, went forth and back returned.
 Above their heads, high over-arching seemed
 An azure firmament outspread, like clear
 Transparent crystal, that inspired with awe.
 Approaching near the firmament, their wings,
 Extending wing to wing, were upward spread.
 With two they bore themselves aloft, with two
 They veiled their bodies round. And as they went
 I heard the rushing sound of wings, like rush
 Of mighty waters, or the distant sound

* Probably an amber colored metal, compounded of the two, of peculiar brilliancy, and highly valued in ancient times, but for which we have no name.
 TRANS.

Of thunder, the dread voice of Shaddai.
 They went with sound of tumult, like an host,
 And where they stopped, they closed again their wings,
 For when, from the o'er-arching firmament
 Above, a voice was uttered forth, they stood
 With wings depending and close veiled around.
 And high upraised above the firmament
 There seemed the sapphire splendor of a throne,
 And on the throne there sat what seemed the form
 Of man. It shone with amber glow of gold
 And silver intermixed as burning fire.
 Both inward and without, and from the loins
 Above and underneath it seemed like fire,
 And shone with radiant luster all around.
 As shines the rainbow in the day of rain,
 So seemed the luster of that radiant form.
 The aspect of Jehovah's majesty
 I saw in this, and fell upon my face,
 And heard the voice of one that spake.'

This remarkable description is repeated, and further explained in Ezek. x. where the prophet was favored with a further view of the cherubim, and with a more distinct understanding of their import and design. As this is the most extended and formal description of the cherubim that occurs in the scriptures, it may be important to make a remark on each of the parts of the account in Ezekiel.

(1.) The vision appeared by the river of Chebar, or the *Chaboras*. The vision came from the *north*, the region lying to the north of Mesopotamia, and a country or region frequently referred to in the scriptures, as the fabled residence of the gods, and probably regarded with superstitious dread by the ancients. Possibly Ezekiel was permitted to see the vision in that direction, either to awe those for whose sake the vision occurred, or to convince the idolaters of that region, that the *true* God came also from that direction, and that there could be no false gods there,—no such gods as they adored. We shall state this tradition and belief in a subsequent part of the article. Comp. Job xxxvii. 22; Isa. xiv. 14; Ezek. xxviii. 14; Zech. vi. 1-6.

(2.) This vision came in the form of a whirlwind; clouds and fire, in rapid motion; the fire infolding itself, and rolling along as a tempest would. There was a tempest,—a driving tempestuous wind, רוח סערה, and a great cloud, and a fire infolding itself, (*taking itself* מִתְלַקְחָה) acting in itself as flame does, and appearing to *roll in* upon itself; and a splendor round about it; and from within a color as of amber. Heb. "as an eye of amber," בְּעֵין הַחֲשָׁמַל. The word rendered amber, חֲשָׁמַל, in the LXX. ἡλεκτρού, denotes properly a bright metal compounded of gold and silver, and giving a peculiar splendor and beauty. This was much esteemed in ancient times. Pliny xxxiii. 4, 23. The idea here is, that there was a peculiarly rich brilliancy in the appearance of

the flame. It was not an ordinary fire, but one that gave a peculiarly rich brilliancy. Ezek. i. 4.

(3.) From this moving whirlwind of cloud and flame, as it drew near, the prophet had view of *four* living creatures, which thus became apparent. Ezek. i. 5-15. Of these living creatures we have a particular description; and it was evidently the design of the prophet so to represent them as to convey a distinct image to the mind.—They are said to have *resembled* living creatures, not designing to intimate probably, that *such* a being or beings here described had an actual living existence, but only, that in certain respects, as in rapid motion, in appearance, they resembled life. Of these forms, he says, there were four. Herder, however, and Gesenius suppose, that there was but one,—a four-fold living thing, or shape. But the more obvious and correct interpretation is, evidently, that there were four forms, or appearances, though they were closely and intimately connected.—They had the likeness of a man. (ver. 5.) That is, there was the general *appearance* of a man; or the form that was most apparent was human. Though to *each* of the four forms there was the appearance of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, yet that which was most striking and predominant was the *human* form. They were not *prone* to the earth, like animals, but were *erect*, like a man. Probably there is reference also to the fact, that as they *appeared* to Ezekiel moving towards him, the figure of the *man* or the human form was prominent.—They had each one four faces and four wings. (ver. 6-11.) Two of their wings were elevated and joined together one to another (ver. 9.); or the wings of the four animals were joined to each other, or closely connected; and perhaps the language here used is that drawn from the description of the cherubim in the tabernacle, where the wings were joined to each other, (Ex. xxvi. 3.); and in the temple, (1 Kings vi. 27.) To each of the animals also *hands* belonged, which were *under* the wings, (ver. 8.); perhaps *withdrawn* from view, or partially hid by the wings. Their *feet* were “straight feet,” and “the sole of their feet like a calf’s foot,” that is, as Herder supposes, *cloven* feet; probably the figure of the *ox* predominated in the lower extremities; and thus there would be a resemblance to the well-known figures of the Sphinx in Egypt. See Calmet’s plates, “Cherubim” 1 and 4. The meaning of the word “straight,” (v. 7.) as applied to their feet, is, that their feet were *perpendicular*, and not *horizontal*, like that of a man. The *human* form, therefore, though it was predominant in the figure, yet was not entire. The *wings* and the *feet* of the ox, or calf, served to distinguish the figure from that of a man. In regard to *these* emblems, it may be observed, that *wings* are a symbol of velocity, and of a readiness to do the will of God. See Isa. vi. What was designed by the foot of the ox, it is perhaps

impossible to conjecture. To each of the animals there were four faces, (v. 10.) They had the face of a man *in front*, that is, as it appeared to Ezekiel; on the right side of the living thing was the face of a lion; on the left the face of an ox;* and they four had also the face of an eagle. Of course this form or face was in the *rear*, or behind the living creature as it appeared to Ezekiel. See a representation of these forms in Calmet's plates, Cherubim 1. What was the exact symbolical design of each of these forms, it may not be possible accurately to determine. It may be observed, however, that the prophet has given a representation of the principal animals that *rule*, or are eminent for dignity and power on earth. Thus the lion is the king of the forest, and rules among the wild beasts; the eagle is the prince among birds; the ox is the more noble among tame beasts, and was distinguished for strength, and held in special honor among the ancients, especially among the Egyptians, where it was worshiped; and man rules over all. The idea is, therefore, that of dominion, power, eminence, velocity, in the animals, and especially in the eagle; and in the human form, the idea of intelligence and wisdom is represented. As the cherubim were emblematical representations of the Deity, perhaps these ideas were conveyed to the mind by the representation.

The mode of their movement was peculiar. (v. 9, 12, 14.) This mode of movement is described by the circumstances, (i. 11.) that they "every one went straight forward;" that "they turned not when they went;" (v. 12.) that "when they went they went upon their four sides, and they returned not when they went." (v. 17.) Each cherub is represented as being attached to a wheel, (v. 15, comp. ch. x. 9.) and these wheels had a peculiar construction, being made as if a wheel were within a wheel. (x. 10; i. 16.) It is not difficult to understand this description, though the symbolical meaning may not be plain. When it is said they "turned not," and "returned not when they went," it is not meant, we presume, that each face or each form did not go forward at any time by itself, or that the four were indissolubly united, so that one could not move alone, nor is it meant that there was no direction in the change of the course of the whole. It is meant that they did not *turn round* as animals do, or as men, when they went to one side, or retreated, so that the different sides of the cherubim were presented to the prophet; but that in whatever form or posture he saw them, they always looked continually in one direction; he saw always the

* What the prophet here calls the face of an ox, in chap. x. 16, he calls the face of a cherub; probably because the figure of the ox was predominant in the composition of the entire animal. So it was in the sphinx.

human appearance in front, and the face of the lion was on the right, of the ox on the left, and the eagle on the rear. They approached him from the north. The human face, or each of the four-fold forms, was always towards the prophet, those of the lion and the ox to the right and left, and those of the eagle backward. Thus the four human faces always appeared in front of the prophet, and always looked to the south, in whatever direction the *group* of living creatures might move, whether south or north, advancing or retreating; whether to the right hand or the left, or diagonally. They *always* looked in the *same* direction, the four human faces always south; the four faces of the ox to the east; the four faces of the lion west; and the four faces of the eagle north; and this in whatever direction the *mass* or *aggregate* moved. In regard to the description of the *wheels*, "the wheel within a wheel," etc., the sense seems to be, they were so made, that this movement, forward or backward, eastward or westward, or diagonally, to any point of the compass, could be effected without any turning around of the form. The wheels were so made, that they would move in one direction as well as in another, without the necessity of *turning*. This was effected, not by making the wheels with *smaller* wheels within the outward periphery, as our translation would seem to imply, not by *concentric* wheels of lessening dimensions, but by wheels *crowning each other* at right angles, and thus presenting a globular form; so that the whole could roll any way without the necessity of turning. The *appearance* of the wheels, therefore, was *globular*, and may be imagined by supposing the great circles of a celestial or terrestrial globe to be solid iron, and constituted into a wheel still in the form of a globe. Thus there was no need for the creatures to be turned, nor for the wheels to be turned, in order that the living creature might move in any direction. It could move rapidly, steadily, firmly, to any part of the compass, and still preserve the same aspect in view of the prophet, or still the human form be that which presented itself to him. *Perhaps* this was an indication, that in whatever way or manner the government of God seemed to move, however changing God *seemed* to be in his movements among men, and however rapid these changes; yet that God's dealings always preserved a steady aspect, looked to the same direction, so to speak, to the same point of the compass, and were always to be regarded as contemplating the same object, and the same result. Whatever the *form* presented,—whether the active intelligent form of *man*, indicating intelligence and counsel; or of the lion advancing to his prey; or of the ox, the symbol of strength; or of the eagle, rapid, decisive, and majestic,—still the government was uniform; there was no confusion, no intermingling of purposes.

Over the living creatures, as seen by Ezekiel, there was what he calls a *firmament*, (ch. i. 22, 25, 26. רָקִיעַ) an *expanse*, or something spread out. This is the same word which is used in Gen. i. 7, and there called the *firmament*, that is, the blue and apparently solid *expanse* which appears to be spread out over our heads in the heavens. The word is rendered in the Septuagint, by στερέωμα, and denotes that which is *solid*, *firm*, and seems to have been used by them because the sky *appears* to be solid, the firm place in which the stars are set, and of sufficient *firmness* to sustain the clouds and vapors. (Schleusner's Lex. V. T. and J. H. Vossii, Not. ad Georgic, iii. 261, and Fuller's Miscell. ss. l. 1. c. vi. and J. D. Michaelis in historia vitri apud Hebræos, § xi.) The idea doubtless, which is here conveyed by the prophet, is, that the moving cherubim were *beneath* the expanse or רָקִיעַ which was spread out over them; that they *sustained* it; and that they are designed to be represented as simple *supports*, on which the *pavement*, firmament, or expanse, rested, and which supported the throne above it. The vision which John had (Rev. iv. 6.) of a similar representation of the divine majesty, accords with this. "And before the throne there was a sea of glass ὡς θάλασσα ὑαλίνη, like unto chrystal." This bright and splendid sea was doubtless the same thing as that seen by Ezekiel, since John also represents the throne to have been accompanied by the same beasts which are here described by Ezekiel. We understand this, therefore, as a description of an *expanse*, or *solid pavement* resting on the moving cherubim, and as being itself the pavement on which the throne of God rested above. This advances us in the description, so that a distinct image may be formed in the mind. The various steps of the form thus far are: First, the wheels that touched the earth,—one to each of the four living creatures,—or four wheels to the entire group, or united appearance. Secondly, over these wheels the four living things, as we have described them, and which were *supports* of the throne above, and *emblematic* of certain attributes of him who sat on it. Thirdly, the pavement of the throne, the expanse, firmament, solid substance of *glass*, according to John, like chrystal, which was stretched out *over* the living creatures, and on which it rested as the footstool or pavement of the throne itself.

The next circumstance in the description therefore, is, that on this expanse, pavement, or "sea of glass," this bright, extended, azure, expanded substance, was the throne, the seat of God. Ezek. i. 26–28; Rev. iv. 6–8. The whole description is designed to terminate here, and to show, that the living creatures, or the cherubim, are symbolical representations of that which bears up, or sustains the majesty of God and the glory of his throne. It is intended, therefore, to be a striking and magnificent representation

of God, and of God particularly as he would come to his temple, (Ezek. x.) and in his majestic and awful government of the world. Thus he appears with the voice of thunder; seeming to come from the throne (Rev. iv. 5.); and this movement was attended with a mighty sound, etc. (Ezek. i. 24.) The splendid and magnificent group is seen by the prophet to approach the temple, and when they approached it the "glory of the JEHOVAH," that is, the *Shechinah*, or visible image of God's presence, "left the threshold of the house, (the temple,) and stood over the cherubim." (Ezek. x. 18.) The visible symbol of the divine presence was thus seated on the throne above the cherubim, and the prophet thus had a pledge that God would come to his people; that he was their protector, and that he would visit and redeem them.

The whole appearance may now be described in a few words.

(1.) The wheels made to turn in every direction,—inseparably attached to the living forms.

(2.) The living creatures above them. The lower extremity was like the ox or the sphinx; the upper form presenting to the prophet the human aspect, always with the head of a lion on the right, of an ox on the left, and of an eagle in the rear. This four-fold form moved easily in all directions, but always with the same front towards each point of the compass.

(3.) The pavement over their heads, and resting on them. This was a bright and beautiful expanse, and was the support of the throne of God.

(4.) The throne of God on this pavement, the emblem of the divine government.

(5.) The visible object *on* that throne. In Ezek. i. 26–28, the appearance of a man of the aspect of amber, and of fire, and with the rainbow around it. Ezek. x. 18–20, the *Shechinah*, or the visible symbol of God. Comp. Rev. i. 14, 15.

(6.) The whole as a manifestation of God in his majesty, coming to Jerusalem, and amidst all the intricate movements of Providence and the disasters of the times, assuring Ezekiel and his countrymen that he was still their God.

That the form of the cherubim here was designed to be an emblematic representation of God, there can be no doubt; but in what respect, must be in a great degree a matter of conjecture. Probably the intention was not to represent a *single* attribute, but *many* of the attributes of the divine nature; as, for example, the wheels, the various movements of divine Providence, made to move in all directions, and yet so that the same aspect should always be presented, the same plan pursued, and the same object attained. The wings may have been symbols of rapid motion; and the *eyes* every where, in the wheels, in the *rims* of the wheels, (x. 12.) symbols of the intelligence, or omniscience of God; the

four faces that appeared, emblems of courage, strength, intelligence, power, etc., and the fact of their being *beneath* the throne, was demonstration, that the government of God was *sustained* by them; or that these would be found at the basis of all his plans and purposes among men. The *whole* was designed to demonstrate to the captive children of Israel, that the mighty God was their protector; that he would come to them with power; that he would deliver them; and that the same God, the Jehovah, the symbol of whose presence had been in the temple, which was now destroyed, would still be the God of this nation, would sit in the throne which was to rule them, (Ezek. x. 18-20.) and would come to their aid and protection. Thus considered, the appearance was full of instruction; but we are not to regard the cherubim as either *living things* on earth or in heaven; but as *emblematical representations* of the attributes and perfections of God.

5. The *fifth* appearance of the cherubim proper to be noticed, is that which occurs in Rev. iv. 6-11. This is noticed in the present order simply because the description is evidently borrowed in its main features from that of Ezekiel. The vision which John had was "in heaven," (iv. 1.) and the whole description is in the main a *transfer* to the heavens of what Ezekiel saw by the river of Chebar; and is a representation of the *worship* which is presented there. *His* view is *first* of the throne and of him who sits upon it (iv. 2.); and this view accords with the one seen by Ezekiel, at the *close* of the vision which appeared to him. (Ezek. i. 28.) Thus, in both there is the rainbow around the throne the jasper, the amber, and the brightness, and the emerald. Compare the two descriptions. *Around* the throne John saw (iv. 3.) what Ezekiel did not see, twenty-four seats and as many "elders," (πρεσβυτέρους) clothed in white raiment, and having on their heads crowns of gold, and these all employed in the adoration of God. (Rev. iv. 10, 11.) Before the throne there was a sea of glass like chrysal, (Rev. iv. 6.) answering to the "firmament" of Ezekiel; and "round about" the throne, and "in the midst ἐν μέσῳ of the throne," were seen "four beasts full of eyes before and behind. The first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, μοσχῷ (the *ox* of Ezekiel,) and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him," etc. Here the description is evidently borrowed from that of Ezekiel, except that the beasts seen by Ezekiel had *four* wings, while those seen by John had *six*; in which he has blended the view of the *cherubim* of Ezekiel with that of the *seraphim* seen by Isaiah. (Isa. vi.) These beasts, as seen by John, or these living creatures, (ζῶα) are employed in praise, and the language which they use is so nearly like the language of the seraphim in Isa-

iah, (Rev. iv. 8. com. Isa. vi. 3.) that there can be no doubt John intended to *minge* the two statements; and to present at a single view a *magnificent description of the Deity*, as drawn in one of the most sublime portions of the old testament, as described in Ezekiel; and at the same time to present ANOTHER view of God as drawn from another grand description of the old testament, where *praise* is the element,—that seen by Isaiah. (vi. 3.) It is not true, therefore, that John intended to represent the cherubim as *angels*, or as intelligent beings; but that he designed to present a magnificent and glowing description of the *appearance* of the Most High, in symbols and images such as are used in the old testament.

If now, we apply the view which we have so far gained of the cherubim to the account in Gen. iii. 24, we shall not infer, that Moses meant to state, that *an angel* was stationed at the gate-way of Eden, or that *any* living being was there; but merely, that *God* guarded the way in a magnificent and striking manner; that he so manifested himself, and so effectually and awfully barred the access, as to render it unapproachable; and that his *attributes* and his *Providence*, represented by the cherubim, constituted an insuperable barrier to the tree of life. In other words, by some *striking* and *awful manifestation* which would be symbolical of his presence, he forever prevented access of the wandering and wretched pair to the tree of life.

The two remaining modes in which the cherubim are mentioned in the scriptures, need not detain us long. They are,

6. The passages in Ex. xxv. 22; Num. vii. 29; Isa. xxvii. 16; Ps. lxxx. 1; xcix. 1; where God is represented as dwelling *between* the cherubim, or *above* the cherubim, and as speaking to his people there, etc. These representations are drawn from the figures of the cherubim in the tabernacle and in the temple, where the visible symbol of Jehovah was on the ark of the mercy-seat; or from the description in Ezekiel, where he is represented as sitting *over* the cherubim, or as sustained and upheld by them. In accordance with these descriptions also, God is represented as riding on the wind and the tempest, where the *clouds* and the *wind* become the *cherub* on which he is borne. Thus, 2 Sam. xxii. 2; Ps. xviii. 10:

And he rode upon a *cherub* and did fly,
And he was seen upon the wings of the wind,

That is, God is represented as coming upon the tempest, as coming rapidly and with power; as coming for deliverance and protection in a mighty manner, or to prostrate his enemies. See Isa. xix. 1:

Lo! JEHOVAH rideth in a swift cloud, etc.

And Habak. iii. 3. seq. :

God came from Teman,
And the Holy One from Mount Paran;
Before him went the pestilence,
And burning coals went forth at his feet, etc.

In all this there is high poetic illustration, designed to represent the majesty and glory of God, and all bearing a striking resemblance to the description in Ezekiel.

7. The only other representation of the cherub, is that in which the king of Tyre is called "the anointed cherub," and "the cherub that covereth." Ezek. xxviii. 14, etc. This description is remarkable, and particularly so, as there is an evident allusion in it to the account in Gen. iii. 24; and the whole description of the king of Tyre as a cherub, is a mere *transfer* to him of language, that was applicable to the cherubim of Eden. The description is of so much importance in illustrating the cherubim of Eden, that we shall copy it in the version proposed by Herder, as translated by Marsh :

' Oh thou, the crown of art, with wisdom filled,
And perfect in thy form, in Eden thou
Hast been, the garden of the Elohim.
With every precious stone wast thou adorned,
With ruby, emerald, and the diamond's fire,
With hyacinth, and jasper, onyx-stone,
And sapphire, and with gold. They welcomed thee,
The day of thy creation, with the voice
Of joy and praise, with drum and trumpet's sound.
I placed thee for the Cherub, that outstretched
Its wings, and guarded Eden; thou didst stand
Upon the holy mountains of the gods.
The Elohim, and up and down didst walk
Amid the stones of fire. In all thy ways
Hast thou been unpolluted, from the day
Of thy creation, till transgression now
Is found in thee. By all thy merchandise
Hast thou been filled with violence and fraud,
And therefore will I thrust thee, as profane,
From out the mountain of the Elohim.
Thee, the protecting Cherub, I destroy,
And cast thee from amidst the stones of fire.' etc.

Spirit of Hebrew Poetry. vol. i. pp. 155, 156.

The *scope* of this description is evident. It is intended to represent the king of Tyre, as magnificent and grand; as distinguished for wealth and riches made by merchandise; as elevated in honor and in privileges; and as having become proud, vain, and corrupt; and therefore as about to be cast down, and destined to be soon destroyed, and to exist no more. The passage is the more important, as it seems in some sense to connect the full and minute description of the cherub, in Ezek. i. 10, with the brief account in Moses, Gen. iii. 24, and to *explain* the sense in which this was understood to be used in Genesis. The

several parts of the *cherub* of Eden, as described by Ezekiel, in his description of the king of Tyre, are the following, viz :

(1.) He had been in Eden, the garden of the Elohim, or of God. (Ezek. xxviii. 13.) The word *God*, here, *Elohim*, אֱלֹהִים referring to some tradition of the garden of the gods, (ver. 14.) called in verse fourteenth "the holy mountain of God," or of the *Elohim*, אֱלֹהִים, and that he had walked up and down in the midst of the coals of fire. This relates undoubtedly to the tradition of the garden of Eden, as having been guarded and secured in this manner by a *cherub*, or by cherubim, who ranged up and down amidst fire ; and is in accordance with the account in Gen. iii. 24.

(2.) The *cherub* of Tyre, the king of Tyre, is adorned with that which was the *production* of the land of Eden. (Ezek. xxviii. 13.) There was "the ruby, the topaz, and the diamond, the onyx, the jasper, the sapphire, and the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold,"—all, or nearly all, the production of the land of Eden. (See Gen. ii. 11, 12.) The allusion here was doubtless to the fact, that *Tyre* had been celebrated for its merchandise, had maintained commercial intercourse with all the world, and had enriched herself with the productions of all climes ; but still the *imagery* is drawn from the terrestrial paradise, and the productions here specified, are mainly those which were found in that region. The image is, that the king of Tyre, like the cherub stationed at the east of Eden, had ranged through these regions which produced in abundance gold and precious stones, the ruby, the emerald, the jasper, the hyacinth, the onyx, and the sapphire. Tyre was the richest commercial city of its day, and this idea is here conveyed under the image of the decorated cherub.

(3.) The king of Tyre is represented as "the anointed cherub that covereth;" (ver. 14.) and as "the covering cherub." (ver. 16.) כְּרוּב מְמִשָּׁה הַסִּבָּה In this place our translators have understood the word מְמִשָּׁה as if it were derived from מָשַׁח to anoint, or to rub over with oil ; as was done to kings and priests, when they were set apart, or consecrated to their office. But this is evidently an erroneous translation, because the word may be derived, and doubtless is, from the root מָשַׁח in Aramean, though it is not found in Hebrew, *to stretch out, extend*, and thus it would denote a stretching out, or extending of the wings, a description entirely applicable to the cherub. The cherub, too, was not *anointed*, nor is there any allusion to such a thing in the scriptures. But the allusion here is doubtless to the *form* of the cherub in the tabernacle, and the temple, where the wings were *stretched out, or extended* over the ark, and, as it were, *protecting* the ark, or covering it, הַסִּבָּה Ex. xl. 3 ; 1 Kings, viii. 7 ; Ex. xxv. 20 ;

xxxvii. 9; Ps. v. 12; xci. 4. The image here is drawn from the form of the cherub over the ark, with extended and protecting wings. See the ancient versions. The Vulgate: "Tu cherub extentus et protegens." The Syriac and the Targum, however, render it by anointed. Targum: "Thou art a king anointed for the kingdom."

The image, however, is plain. Though Ezekiel is describing the cherub in the mountains of the north, or near the garden of Eden, yet his image is that which is taken from the temple,—a cherub with outstretched covering wings, *protecting*, as it were, the holy mercy-seat, and bending over it with anxious care and attention.

(4.) This cherub is represented as placed by Jehovah "upon the holy mountain of God," (ver. 14.) and it is said "thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire." And in ver. 16, God says, "I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God, and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire." Here there is evident allusion to the cherub of Eden, and the *mount* which is not unfrequently referred to as the mountain of the north, and as the mountain of God. The allusion has two parts. First, "Thou wast upon the holy mountain of God," (ver. 14.) *בְּהַר קֹדֶשׁ אֱלֹהִים* in the holy mountain of the ELOHIM, or of the gods. The same thing is referred to in Isa. xiv. 13, 14, which we shall soon notice more distinctly and fully. The obvious and most natural interpretation of this phrase would be, to regard it as in accordance with a tradition, or oriental belief, that the land of Eden, (Ezek. xxxviii. 13.) was in that region, which is here supposed to be near "the mountains of the gods," or Elohim; the place where they congregated or assembled for counsel. That this mountain should be so called with any allusion to the true God, or to JEHOVAH, is wholly improbable; since in no instance are any of the mountains of Eden, or of Armenia, so called. The second part of the allusion here, is to the fact, that the cherub was accustomed to walk "up and down in the midst of the stones of fire." (Ezek. xxviii. 14, 16.) Whether these stones are to be considered as precious stones, or whether they were regarded as fiery eruptions, or meteors, or burning mountains, perhaps cannot be determined, and could be ascertained only by a thorough acquaintance with the views which were entertained in regard to this mountain of the gods in the north. That this image of glowing, or burning stones, was placed in Eden, and that the cherub was represented as ranging among them, and walking up and down in them; that this was regarded as an honor (ver. 16.) from which by his sins he was to be cast out, is sufficient for our present purpose. We have here obtained a view of the cherub of Eden, which served as an *illus-*

tration or representation of one of the most splendid and magnificent kings of the east. He is on the mountain of the Elohim; he is adorned with all the brilliant productions of that land; he ranges freely up and down those hills; and his going is amidst burning coals, or stones; or amidst flames and fire-balls, emblems of magnificence and grandeur. We are now prepared in the

8. *Eighth* place, to ask, whether we can gain any light on this subject from tradition or any accounts of the east. And here we may remark, that all accounts which we have been examining, seem to *suppose* the existence of a tradition, pointing out the mountains of the north, or the mountains north of Judea, and of Chaldea, as the residence of the gods, or the place where they assembled. Thus in Isaiah xiv. 13, we have such an allusion in the vain purpose and mad ambition of the monarch of Babylon. His aim was to "sit upon the mount of the congregation, (Heb. the place of assembling, the appointed place of convocation, בְּהַר-מוֹעֵד) in the sides of the north." It could not mean Jerusalem; for this was no part of the ambition of the king of Babylon; but his purpose was to ascend above *all* the gods that convened in the *north*, or on these mountains. We see, too, by the mention of "the north," in Isaiah, that this was the same direction from which the cherubim came (Ezek. i. 10.); and on the supposition we have made, that the land of Eden was in this direction, the same place where the cherub by which was represented the king of Tyre, ranged, and was seen. (Ezek. xxvii.) Ezekiel, too, was among the captives at Babylon. He was near the river Chaboras, in the northern part of Mesopotamia. *North* of himself he saw the cherubim of the sacred scriptures. The fact that he was there, and the correspondent tradition in Isaiah, (xiv. 12.) show some tradition to have existed in which the mountains to the north of Chaldea, were supposed to be the residence of fabled beings; of gods; of beings who moved in the whirlwind and in fire, and ranged those mountains, and there held their assemblies. Not improbably one design of Ezekiel in representing his cherubim as coming from that region, was to convince the captive Jews, who might be in danger, from the prevalence of these traditions, of supposing false gods to range the mountains of the north, that all this *was* fable; that there were no such beings; and that there was but one true God. The Jews there were surrounded by heathen. They would learn their traditions. They were in danger of idolatry. They had been removed there to deliver them from idolatry. To *counteract*, therefore, the tendency of this oriental belief in their minds and hearts; to impress them with the belief, that there was but *one* God, and that he far surpassed all the other gods of the east, in power and majesty; and to shew them also, that the true God

presided in the regions of the north, where the false gods were fabled to reign and revel. A representation was made to Ezekiel, (ch. i. 10.) clothed in all the grand and glowing imagery of the east; collecting together all that had produced awe and wonder in their views of the fabled beings of the north; coming in the whirlwind, and amidst fire, and attended with every demonstration of terror and alarm; and *all this* as the mere *symbol* of the attributes of Jehovah, and the emblems of his power. All this was *beneath* his throne; he presided over all. He ruled in *the north*. He came from those regions that produced such representations. *He* preceded them; and thus the fact was demonstrated to the Jews, that there were no *other* gods there. *Their* God, and the God of their fathers, was there. He came in the whirlwind; moved to the temple (Ezek. x.); the sacred symbol of Jehovah ascended the throne; and this all in the view of the captive Jews, led them to the belief, that there was but one God, and that he was clothed with indescribable magnificence.

It may be impossible now to trace what was the *origin* of this tradition. Will it be regarded as a rash conjecture to suppose it possible that the following was the origin? The mountains of Armenia might have been for a long time inaccessible, uninhabited, and unknown. A loose and vague tradition may have come down, that this was once the seat of blessedness, and the residence of man in innocency. On those mountains, those vast untenanted wastes, they may have supposed, that spirits ranged and the gods whom they adored resided. Perhaps the bursting splendor of the aurora borealis,—the flashing of that unknown light,—its brilliant corruscations across the heavens,—its ever-varying and playing forms of magnificence, may have led to the idea, that these lights gleamed and played around the habitations of the gods in the north, and that beneath them, and in the midst of them, they dwelt and held their revels. These distant, solitary, unknown, untrodden regions; these “sides of the north,” (Isa. xiv. 13.) might have been deemed to be the appropriate abodes of the gods, and the magnificent temple where they held their conventions and their courts.

This may be fancy. But it has *some* foundation at least in the few traces of this tradition which are found in the scriptures. In heathen writings, also, there are some allusions to the same facts here referred to, though the *inaccessibleness* of these regions is traced by them to burning naptha, or bitumen. Thus Strabo (lib. xvi. p. 1078,) speaks of the quantities of naptha or bitumen which were found in the vicinity of Babylonia, and which were consumed. Pliny, (Hist Nat. l. ii. c. 19, § 109.) says, that the region of Babylonia abounded in naptha, and that it was easily inflamed. Curtius, (L. v. c. 1. § 16.) mentions a cavern in these regions, that poured out a vast quantity of bitumen. Plutarch, in

the life of Alexander, (c. xxxv.) says, that "Babylonia is easily inflamed," etc. See Rosenmueller, on Gen. iii. 24. It is *possible*, that the burning fires in this region, or in the regions on the north of Babylonia, and in the direction of Armenia, may have given rise to some of the traditions which prevailed in the east on the subject. At all events, it is certain, that a tradition *did* prevail, of the regions or mountains on the north of Chaldea, or in Armenia, as being the assembling place of the gods; as being traversed by the "cherubim," and as being inflamed, or the seat of flame, and as inaccessible to men. We have thus examined the various passages in the scriptures on this very difficult subject. It would be almost useless to detail the various opinions which have been formed in regard to the shape and the design of the cherubim.

In forming our opinion respecting the design and nature of the cherubim, after this extended investigation, we may state the following as the result to which we have come :

(1.) They were not *angels*. They are never spoken of as such. Nor are they represented either as angels, or as designed to indicate real forms of life. The idea of an *angel*, therefore, at the entrance of the garden of Eden, is the idea of a philosophy or the notion of the nursery; and without any foundation in the scriptures.

(2.) They are not designed to *represent* angels in heaven or on earth. There is no intelligible sense in which they can represent the angels, nor any purpose that could be accomplished by such a magnificent representation of *angels*, as is presented by the cherubim of Ezekiel.

(3.) They are not designed, as Parkhurst supposed, to represent the human body of Jesus Christ. It is sufficient to say, in regard to this, that there is not even the *appearance* of argument on the subject. There is no affirmation, no allusion, no *hint* even of such a design; and this, therefore, must be regarded as a mere figment of the brain.

(4.) They are not emblems of the ministers of the gospel, appointed to guard the entrance to the church, and to prevent access by unworthy and unfit persons, as Bush (Notes on Gen. iii. 24.) and Duncan (Lectures on Moral Government, p. 350, seq.) suppose. It is sufficient to say in reply to this supposition, that it lacks *all* evidence, and that there is not adduced a passage of the scripture in which the allusion can be found.

(5.) There is no evidence, that they were hieroglyphical representations, "denoting the perfection or combination of all spiritual and moral excellences which constitute the character of God's faithful servants and subjects." (Taylor, Heb. Con.) Though this opinion, that they are hieroglyphical representations has much

plausibility, yet there is no evidence, that they are designed to represent such a perfection or combination.

In coming to a conclusion in regard to this subject, we must make a distinction between the *traditions* which prevailed in the east, respecting the mountains of the gods, the mountains of the north, etc., and the views which *the sacred writers had*, and which they designed to present. The *history* of the cherubim we take to be this. The tradition, from whatever source it may have arisen, prevailed in the region of Chaldea, of uninhabitable regions and mountains in the north, the seats of the assemblies of the gods; regions that were enveloped in flame, either by burning naphtha or the aurora borealis; and within this region was placed, by universal tradition, the native dwelling-place of man. This region was inaccessible. It was guarded by ever-burning fires. It was ranged by "the gods," and there they held their convocations. All this was tradition, fancy, fiction; yet such as was grand, and impressive, and awful. It was such moreover, as might be employed by truth, as a high poetic representation of God, his attributes and his designs. As it was,—as it prevailed among the Pagans of that region, it was false and pernicious. Yet it might be employed by the sacred writers as a striking emblematic representation of the true God; and *all* the circumstances of magnificence and grandeur might be combined to give an imposing representation of the divine being.

The sacred writers, therefore, we suppose, made use of this *language* and this *imagery* as a striking symbolical representation of the *manner* of God's appearing among men. In high poetic language, he is represented as coming in the clouds; as riding on the wind; coming in the tempest, the storm, the pestilence, etc. When all these circumstances are combined in one magnificent description, they are designed to represent God as coming on a *chariot-throne*; or a moving *throne sustained* by the cherubim,—and moving on wheels, as seen by Ezekiel. God is represented as a king; as advancing in royal state; as seated on a throne; as riding in majesty. That throne is sustained by moving forms, and by various emblematic figures, all designed to be expressive of the divine perfections, etc., and all intended to present the pomp and magnificence of the divinity. The whole scene, therefore, is an emblematic representation of God as king and sovereign; and is designed to exhibit *him* as the ruler and governor of all, and as presiding over universal nature, and encompassing himself with all the emblems of royalty. This idea has been expressed in a sublime manner by Milton:

—— "Forth rushed with whirlwind sound
The chariot of Paternal Deity,
Flashing thick flames, wheel within wheel undrawn,
Itself instinct with spirit; but conveyed

By four cherubic shapes ; four faces each
 Had wondrous ; as with stars their bodies all,
 And wings were set with eyes, with eyes the wheels
 Of beryl, and careering fires between."

Par. Lost. b. iv. l. 750, seq.

Carrying now the description of the cherubim of Ezekiel to that over the mercy-seat, we shall find, that the figures there were designed to present the same idea. The *forms* of the animals there retained were emblematic of God. The wheels, the whirlwind, the fire of Ezekiel and of Moses, (Gen. iii. 24.) could not be introduced within the tabernacle and the temple, and therefore, a *part* of the representation only was used.

Applying it to the cherubim *in the heavens*, it is the throne of God ; that in which he sits and rides ; the magnificent representation of the Deity.

Applying it to the account in Revelations, it is still an account of the *chariot-throne* of the Deity, as encompassed with a multitude of worshipers, and designed simply to represent HIS magnificence, splendor, and grandeur.

Applying the idea to the garden of Eden, (Gen. iii. 24.) *it is a poetic, grand, and sublime description of God, as coming forth in his majesty ; and himself guarding the way to the tree of life.* God is there : God, in his majesty, closes the avenue to life in that way. God secures the way against a return. God in his terror, and justice, and grandeur ; God in all his perfections,—represented by the severity of the lion, the firmness of the ox, the intelligence of the man, the penetrating eye of the eagle, *secures* the way to the tree of life. God, by the flames of his chariot, representing the terror of his presence, bars the access to that tree forever. It is not a bugbear, or a scarecrow that is there. It is not an angel standing in useless pomp, and brandishing a drawn sword, day and night, to guard that tree from the approach of one feeble and helpless pair of wanderers ; it is *God himself*, who effectually and forever on earth, has closed the gates of Paradise Lost, and who now prevents all hopes of salvation by works. Man is a wanderer. The Creator has expelled him from Eden. He will forever prevent his obtaining life in any other way than as a wanderer and a sinner, and through that plan obscurely announced in Eden, but which was *all* the consolation that was left for the apostate and ruined pair as they,

"Hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow,
 Through Eden took their solitary way."

ART. IV.—BEECHER ON COLLEGES.

An Address, delivered at the tenth anniversary celebration of the Union Literary Society of Miami University, September 29, 1835. By LYMAN BEECHER, D. D. Cincinnati: 1835.

A SECOND edition of this address has appeared at the west, under the title of "a plea for colleges,"—a title which describes the subject of the discourse, as that of the first edition describes the occasion on which it was delivered. The discourse—which in every feature bears strong marks of its paternity—is a vindication of the system of liberal education which the colleges of this country are designed to give, and which in various degrees of efficiency they generally do give to their pupils.

Colleges are public institutions. To the public the guardians and teachers of colleges, however constituted, are continually accountable. On the public favor they are constantly dependent, not only for students, but for those continued benefactions which are necessary to enable them to lead, or even to keep pace with, the progress of improvement in the world around them. The chief value of this pamphlet is, that it pleads the cause of colleges, not only with men of cultivated minds, but with the people at large.

To the people at large,—at least to all who are disposed to bear a part in efforts for the advancement of the welfare of our country in this and coming ages,—the question of the utility of college or university education, and of what it ought to include; the question of the right constitution of colleges, and of what belongs to their proper management and discipline; and the question of the extent to which such institutions ought to be multiplied, are questions of moment. Every parent who desires to educate his son for any liberal profession, every citizen who has either influence or money to bestow, even in slender contributions, for the establishment or support of literary institutions, should be able to form an opinion intelligently on these questions. Some of these points are very ably managed in the pamphlet before us; and the fact, that this publication, though bearing Dr. Beecher's name, has not yet found its way into a general circulation this side of the mountains, induces us to indulge in a more extended notice than we commonly bestow upon discourses made and published on similar occasions.

Why are colleges needed? Why is the public called upon to endow institutions for the higher departments of education? Why is the call continually made for the extension of such endowments?

Colleges are needed, because without them there cannot be that division of labor, that distribution of functions among the various

members of society, which constitutes civilization. In the words of Dr. Beecher,—

‘ The attempt to produce a social equality by assigning to every man the supply of his own wants, is to hang weights upon society, and chain it down to barbarism. The multiplication of enjoyment, and the division of labor for the supply, is the only method of filling the earth with a dense, intelligent, virtuous, joyful population, equal to the capabilities of man, and the revealed purposes of Divine Mercy. To economize and retrench, may be a temporary duty indicated by the vastness of the work to be done, and the small amount of numbers and capital engaged in it. But the stated policy of heaven is to raise the world from its degraded condition, by amplifying immeasurably its sphere of action, and its facilities and motives to enjoyment. In the primitive age of the christian dispensation, the requisite means of its propagation were provided by rendering life uncertain, and property valueless by its insecurity. But this was on the eve of the downfall of civilized society into a thousand years of darkness and barbarism—and is not the method by which God will elevate the whole family of man from barbarism, to the highest possible condition of purity and peace, and social enjoyment. As the world, by the power of the gospel and the Holy Ghost, comes under the influence of religion, and the number and the capital of christians increase, God will enlighten, and elevate, and purify the condition of the world—not by persecution and disaster, but by the augmentation of liberty, and the safety of life and property—by the facilities of art, the increase of capital, and men of enterprise, who will use this world as not abusing it, and appropriate their income under the guidance of the wisdom which is from above. It is under the providential influence of this fundamental law of divided labor, that the great departments of agriculture, commerce, and the arts have been assigned to different hands, educated for their work; while to another and a large class has been assigned the instruction, and discipline, and government of the mind. To the perfection of science and the arts, an order of educated men has always been requisite; but for the education, and discipline, and control of mind itself—of universal mind—of mind free as air, and so intelligent and virtuous as to be itself the universal legislator and executive and voluntary subject of its own laws—the best talent which God has delegated to men, and the best culture which man can bestow, are unquestionably required. In this necessity, literary institutions have originated in all civilized nations, to qualify the portion of mind which is destined to act upon mind, for the various spheres of professional instruction, and moral and religious cultivation.’ pp. 3, 4.

Under free political institutions,—the very definition of which is, or ought to be, free scope for all the talents and energy of every citizen,—the demand for a class of highly educated men, and for places of education from which such a class shall be supplied, is greater than under any other form of government.

‘In despotic governments, literary institutions have constituted a monopoly of intellectual power—an aristocracy of literature and cultivated mind,—light upon the mountain top, while the valleys sat in darkness—fountains in high places, whose streams sent down a penurious supply to the plains below. It answered well the purposes of despotism, in qualifying the few to govern by force the unreflecting multitude. But in a republic, where the whole people legislate, and public sentiment is the supreme executive, the intellectual and moral culture of the nation must become universal and elevated, demanding an increase of colleges and professional men proportioned to the elevated standard and universality of education. A nation can no more educate itself for a republican government, without colleges, and academies, and schools, and professional teachers, than it can feed and clothe itself without agriculturists and manufactories.’ p. 4.

Colleges then are for the whole commonwealth; and the idea that they are for the benefit of a particular class in the community, is only one of those chimeras with which malignant or ambitious men sometimes attempt to abuse the ignorant. The funds which endow a university are not for the benefit of its professors, to support them in sinecure stations, to make them a privileged order, or to enable them to get a living more easily than the merchant or the mechanic gets his. “Mental labor is as really labor as muscular action, and the operatives in our colleges and seminaries and schools are as truly and eminently working-men, and work as many hours, and, in respect to the taxation upon health and strength, work as hard, as the husbandman on his farm, or the artisan in his workshop.” Nor is there any class of laborers whose labor subserves more directly the welfare of the whole commonwealth. The means of education which colleges afford, are not for the exclusive benefit of the men who are actually educated within their walls. Every man who has an intelligent and high-minded lawyer to advise him in regard to his rights, instead of an ignorant quibbling pettifogger,—every man who can call to his aid in sickness, a scientific physician, instead of giving himself up to die by steam and lobelia,—every man who can put his children under the tuition of a well informed instructor, instead of such a teacher as might be found in one of the hovel-schools of Ireland,—every man who has the privilege of hearing the gospel expounded by an educated pastor, instead of waiting on the ministry of an Abyssinian monk, shares in the benefits which colleges and universities confer on society.

But besides all this, in every community where colleges and universities are endowed and open to the public without distinction of rank or sect, they are yet more immediately the common inheritance of every citizen. They bring education, in the highest sense of the word, within the reach of the middling and even the humbler classes in society. The journeyman mechanic, or the day

laborer, who at the age of twenty-one begins a course of honest industry, as his own master, knows, that if God shall give him a son of promising talents, he may, with ordinary diligence and no extraordinary success, be able to secure for that son an education which shall be worth more to him than the wealth of a nabob. In the university class-room, the poor man's son stands on the same level with the sons of the rich, and from the university they go forth with equal advantages for the toil and conflict of life. In this country, and in every other civilized land, the colleges and universities open to young men of talents from the middling and poorer classes, the surest and shortest road to eminence. Take away these institutions, and you take away from every poor man an invaluable part of his inheritance as a citizen of such a country.

‘Colleges and schools are truly the intellectual manufactories and workshops of the nation, and in their design and results, are preeminently republican institutions. They break up and diffuse among the people that monopoly of knowledge and mental power which despotic governments accumulate for purposes of arbitrary rule, and bring to the children of the humblest families of the nation a full and fair opportunity of holding competition for learning, and honor, and wealth, with the children of the oldest and most affluent families—giving thus to the nation the select talents and powers of her entire population, and counteracting the tendencies to voluptuous degeneracy, by a constant circulation in the body politic of the unwasted vigor of its most athletic sons. In this manner the extremes of rich and poor meet together—excluding patrician and plebeian contentions, by the constant changes which justice produces in elevating the lower classes, and rewarding every man according to his talents and deeds; uniting the nation by a constant communion of honor and profit, and the wide-spread alliance of the ties of blood. The colleges of a republic are eminently the guardians of liberty and equality, and the great practical equalizers of society. So great is the wealth of this nation, and so fast accumulating, that were it not that by collegiate education the children of the poor can hold competition with the sons of the rich, the entire cultivated intellect of the nation would soon be in the families of the rich, and the children of the poor doomed to an iron cast of hopeless inequality of intelligence and influence.’ p. 5.

Regarding the subject in this point of view, it is easy to see why colleges must be largely endowed. Endowments are necessary, that the college may offer education at less than cost, and may thus bring down the expenses of a liberal education within the reach of the greatest possible number of families. Let the principle be established, that those who receive instruction at colleges and universities, shall pay all the wages of instructors, and besides that, shall pay full interest on all the capital invested in grounds and buildings, in libraries and apparatus, and what will be the result? First, a liberal education is too expensive to be

hoped for by those who have only a competency. The rich have a monopoly of the higher branches of knowledge. Next, as none but rich men's sons are liberally educated, there is an end of that class of liberally educated men who are so much needed, and whom endowed colleges always supply to teach in academies, in private schools, in common schools, and by various agencies to diffuse knowledge in all directions. As things now are, thousands who never go near a college, receive instruction from the alumni of colleges; but let there be no alumni of colleges, save those who belong to the aristocracy of wealth, and whence are these teachers to be provided?

There is yet another view of this topic. No small part of the wealth of every civilized community,—by which we mean the amount of conveniences and comforts in the possession of the individuals and families of that community,—is to be ascribed directly to the employment of science in devising means for the more rapid production of wealth. Take away from any community the means of education in the sciences, and you take away the possibility of such improvements. Let colleges be so organized, that none but the rich shall be able to obtain a scientific education, and you diminish indefinitely the number of those minds which are likely to make discoveries in science, or to apply such discoveries to the improvement of the arts and processes of productive industry. In the year 1789, the son of a New-England farmer, a young man in his twenty-fourth year, who by adding to the profits of his manual labor the profits of teaching a district school, had acquired in part the means of pursuing study, entered Yale College. In 1792, the same young man, having received the honors of his college, went to Georgia as a teacher, to earn the means of pursuing his studies still farther. There, at the solicitation of persons engaged in agriculture, he applied his native talents, disciplined by education, and guided by the lights and landmarks of science, to the work of inventing machinery, that should facilitate the production of the great staple of southern agriculture. The result was the cotton-gin, which has not only augmented the wealth of the southern States by more than one hundred millions of dollars, but by reducing the price of cotton, and every thing that can be fabricated of cotton, has had the effect of bringing a far greater share of physical comforts, and consequently of all the outward means of happiness, within the reach of every inhabitant of christendom. Every body that wears a cotton shirt, or cotton stockings, or sleeps under a cotton-stuffed comfortable in winter, or reads a book printed on cotton paper, is the richer for the education of the young man who went to college from Westborough, Mass. in May, 1789. If Yale College had never done any thing for the public benefit, besides affording to

Whitney the opportunity of acquiring a scientific education, the institution would have already repaid, ten thousand times, all that has ever yet been done for its endowment and support.

Colleges then, endowed institutions for liberal education, are indispensable to the welfare of free and civilized communities, and their influence reaches every individual with an augmentation of all the means of human happiness. And it is but a despicable trick, below the wisdom of Jack Cade, to represent colleges as designed for the rich and not for the poor, for the few and not for the many.

What ought to be included in a liberal education? Or to state the question less abstractly, Ought the system of liberal education pursued in our colleges to be radically reformed? Whether it ought to be improved by being made more thorough, and more extensive, is not the question. That there is room for improvement, both in the text-books and in the manner of teaching, will be admitted in all quarters; and indeed the progress of improvement is no where more rapid or more sure than in the colleges of the United States. The question is, Whether radical reform, the re-construction of the system on new principles, ought to come in the place of improvement. To the discussion of this point, our author addresses himself very earnestly, and with good reason, for it is a point which in these times of enterprise, agitation, and revolution, is becoming daily more and more important.

On this question, opinions are offered in abundance by all sorts of theorists. Some cry out against mathematical study. What is the use of poring over conics and spherics; and if astronomy must needs be studied, why not learn it from some traveling lecturer, who, with the aid of diagrams and pictures, will make his pupils understand the whole subject well enough for all practical purposes in half a dozen evenings? Others argue against the study of the ancient classics, and demonstrate to their own satisfaction, the folly of bestowing time on the acquisition of languages that are never to be spoken; they hold it as a great principle, that whatever is dead ought to be buried; for even the few scraps of Latin that are uttered at commencement, have an ill savor in their nostrils. Some seem devoutly to believe, that our colleges are formed and conducted after the pattern seen in the mount by the angelic and seraphic doctors of the ages before the Reformation; and they demand that the colleges be re-modeled after some plan, they know not what, which they have heard of from Utopia. Some plead for a practical education: why should the pupil be puzzled with metaphysics?—Of what use will it be to him to be able to scan the odes of Horace or of Pindar?—Why should he learn the theory of eclipses, unless he expects to be a maker of almanacs?—Let him learn that which will come in play in the

practical details of the profession to which he expects to devote himself. Others, having an idea that colleges are unfavorable to piety, have no doubt that all colleges need a radical reform in this respect; and their theory is, that not the development and discipline of the intellectual faculties, but the culture of a devotional spirit, ought to be the distinctive character of college education. Others still,—though they are not so many just now as they were three years ago,—believe that the present system of college education involves a great destruction of health and life; that multitudes of students die victims to the perverseness of college corporations and college faculties; and that such as escape with their lives, come out with broken constitutions, poor, puny, whitehanded, lily-livered, dyspeptic, wrecks and fragments of human nature; and their plan is, to add to all the labors of the mind the labor of the body, and by combining mechanical and agricultural industry with intellectual effort, to make the student a perfect man, furnished for every good word and work.

Looking now at all these aspects of the demand for a radical reform in colleges, we are arrested by a consideration which at first sight seems to be conclusive as to the nature and character of the demand. Such is the competition among the many colleges of this country, dependent as they all are on their merits, or at least on the public estimation of their merits, for support; and such is the readiness of the public to run after all sorts of novelties, particularly in education, that if there were any thing like an intelligent and real demand for a new system of college education, that demand would instantly be met. If a college in which Latin should be superseded by French, and Greek by German, and in which the diagrams of Gall and Spurzheim should receive equal attention with the diagrams of Euclid, were really demanded, such a college would soon be found; if such a system be really a wise one, the success of that college in bringing forward young men with superior qualifications for usefulness and success in active life, would soon compel all rival institutions to adopt an equally radical reform. But what is the fact? The cry that colleges are behind the age, and ought to be reformed by the lights of modern wisdom, is as old at least as our earliest recollections of such matters; and yet, hitherto it has been impossible for any institution, professing to give a liberal education, to obtain a permanent support without adopting substantially the same system with other colleges. Within a few years past, one college after another has been established with great professions of being more conformed than older institutions to the spirit and exigencies of the age. The interests of a sect or party, or the interests of a town, are supposed to require the establishment of a college. But the college must have funds, more than the sectarian interest,

or the local interest, or the combination of the two, can command; and it must have not only funds but students. In these circumstances, it is easy for those interested to believe and say, that the exigencies of the age demand a great reform in the system of liberal education, and that such a reform is to be realized in their new institution. Thus the zeal of the projectors and patrons is quickened, a building is erected, professors are appointed, operations are commenced with great expectations of reform. But what is the result? After a few months, if we hear from that quarter at all, we hear no more of reforming the system of liberal education. We hear no more of a partial course and an English diploma, no more of a practical education, no more of the modern languages substituted for the ancient, no more of throwing mathematics into the back ground, and taking up something more agreeable and fascinating to the youthful mind. The institution which was to be so sweeping in its plan of reform,—so revolutionary in its bearings on the old monastic system, has gone over to the conservatives; and there, as in colleges upon whose charters the dust of ages has gathered, students are urged up the hill of science, groaning as they go under the oppression of a faculty so merciless as to insist on the discipline of Greek and mathematics. How does this come to pass? It comes to pass simply because, though the liberality and zeal of the public may endow an institution on the principles of reform, the common-sense of the public refuses to support such institutions. The father who wishes to educate his son; the young man who inspired with the love of knowledge, wishes to educate himself, will seek not that education which approaches nearest to the ideal of radical reform, but that which is most thorough and effectual; and it is soon found, that if the college is to be filled with students, and especially with such students as are worth having, the cry about reform must be hushed, and the same system, substantially, with that which is successful in other institutions must be adopted.

The demand, then, for radical reform in colleges, originates not in the common-sense of the country; not in the wishes of intelligent fathers, or of young men whose genius moves them to the pursuit of learning; but rather in the dreams of projectors, most of whom, if they had the opportunity, would refuse to send a son of theirs to a college framed according to their theory.

The demand for improvement is another thing; and in our serious judgment, the men who stand at the head of our colleges owe it to their country to spare no pains in raising the standard of liberal education as fast and as far as possible. This is to be done by insisting on a more extended and thorough preparation for college, and by making the mental discipline of college studies more rigorous and effectual.

Why should not a young man of competent talents, who has been studying Latin for two or three years, be expected to have a respectable knowledge of the Latin language? The time was when a shorter course of study secured for the pupil a more creditable acquaintance with Latin words and idioms, than is now possessed by more than one in twenty of those who present themselves for admission to college. But now the language is studied only in the way of analysis and translation from Latin into English. To speak Latin,—to translate from English into Latin,—nay even to write Latin, unless it be some simple exercises in such a book as Clarke's Introduction, is a thing almost unheard of, except in a few schools preeminently favored. The consequence is, the pupil is led through the prescribed volumes of Virgil, Cicero, and Sallust, and is fitted for an examination on those volumes, but in the meanwhile learns very little Latin to any good purpose. In truth it is a principle which our modern grammar-schools seem to have lost sight of, that no language is learned effectually, unless the learner becomes master of it, that is, acquires the power of commanding its words and idioms for his own use. The old mode of teaching Latin was to unite analysis and synthesis,—to exercise the student not only in rendering from Latin into English, but also in rendering from English into Latin; and where this method is pursued,—and it is pursued still in the schools of every country but our own,—not only is the discipline of mind more valuable, but the power of reading a Latin author with ease and pleasure is acquired far more rapidly. It is a sinful waste of time and talent to teach Latin as it is now commonly taught in fitting boys for our colleges. Let the schools go back to the old method; and without occupying a month of additional time, they may send their pupils to college not merely fitted to "construe and parse" the prescribed books, but so well acquainted with the language as to be able thenceforward to read Latin authors profitably and with delight.

Nor is there any good reason why Greek should not be studied in the same way. For example, if the Greek testament is used as a classic, why should not the pupil learn not merely to read the Greek into English, but also to take the English testament, or, better still the Latin, and read it into Greek? To associate the English word with the corresponding Greek word is one process of mind. To associate the Greek word with the English is another process. Where the two associations are formed simultaneously, they greatly aid each other, and the whole is more deeply fixed in the memory. In this way the task of learning the Greek language as well as the Latin, may be pretty effectually attended to before the pupil presents himself for the first time at college.

We are not ignorant, that no college can safely attempt to advance faster than the public, and the preparatory schools in particular, are prepared to follow. Yet we know on the other hand, that the schools in their modes of instruction, and in the diligence with which their pupils are trained, are greatly influenced by the colleges; and we are confident, that if some two or three of the leading colleges shall undertake gradually to bring about such an improvement as we have here indicated, they may in the course of a few years see this improvement actually secured, to the great advantage of the commonwealth.

Such an improvement having been effected in the scheme of preparatory study, the way is open of course for a more profitable employment of the four years spent within the walls of college. As things now are in most of our institutions, the study of the classics, occupying in all something like two years of the four, is the study of the Latin and Greek rather than of the authors or of the subjects treated by them. Horace and Homer are studied not as poetry, but only as Latin and Greek. Tacitus and Thucydides are studied not as majestic models of history, but as very hard Latin and Greek. Cicero de Officiis is not thought of as a book in moral philosophy; nor Cicero de Oratore as a treatise on rhetoric; but both are set down under the head of "dead languages." In some colleges we know it is not exactly so; perhaps in all, this description may seem a little like caricature; but we are sure, that the vicious mode of teaching Latin, into which our schools have fallen within the last sixty years, cripples the scholarship of most students, not only through college, but through life.

The most effective part of the college course of study, regarded as a system for the discipline of the mind, is to be found, as the colleges and schools now are, in the study of mathematics. The mathematical sciences have this advantage, that if studied at all, they must be studied with the mind wide awake,—the attention must be closely fixed upon a single point,—the faculty of abstraction must be active,—the process by which truth is evolved from truth, must be actually performed. Such benefits must result from any study of the mathematics, however imperfectly directed. These benefits do result to the college classes; and so far as we have had opportunity to compare the different developments of intellectual character formed by the methods of education at different institutions,—a comparison which may easily be instituted at a great theological seminary,—those colleges in which mathematical studies are most cultivated, generally produce the best disciplined minds. Yet we are far from imagining, that college education is to be improved by putting such studies more and more into the foreground, or by carrying the student over a more extended course of mathematics. On the contrary, we believe, that

all the benefits of mathematical study as a means of disciplining the faculties, may be realized without throwing other departments into the shade. Only let it be remembered, that in improving the plan of college education, this most effective instrument for disciplining the mind, must not be improved away, but must ever be regarded as too valuable to be dispensed with. If, however, a little more mathematical knowledge can be added to the requisites for admission to college,—for example, if to a mechanical familiarity with the rules and processes of arithmetic, there can be added some acquaintance not only with the theory of numbers, but also with the elementary propositions and reasonings of geometry; and if thus more time can be gained for other branches of knowledge, this improvement would be of such a kind as we desire for the advantage of our own sons as well as of the public.

It would seem, that the leading departments of natural science are too popular, too fascinating with the recency and brilliancy of their discoveries, too easy of acquisition, and too directly connected with the increase of national wealth, to fail of receiving their full share of attention. It would seem, too, that the arts of eloquence and the graces of literature cannot be in any danger of falling into contempt in the present day. Against these things there is no outcry, even among the reformers. Against these things the students themselves, even in dog-days, are not apt to murmur, no not the most indolent and stupid. Yet how many colleges are there in the land, annually advertising their ability to give a liberal education, whose means of instruction in the most popular and important of the natural sciences, are not to be spoken of without pity; though in this respect every institution, we believe, is disposed to do all it can. How many colleges are there, whose graduated alumni have never been drilled to habits of purity, precision, and force, in the use of their own mother tongue. And when we remember what sort of training is required to fit the mind for the great function of controlling other minds by the spoken or written utterance of thought, we realize what room there is for improvement in those institutions whose system is already the most thorough and effective. The knowledge of things, the power of connecting thought with thought aright, the skill to discriminate where there is fallacy, and to unravel where there is perplexity, the nice and prompt perception of the force of words, and the practiced sweep of mind, that can bring analogies from every quarter to explain the difficult, and to illustrate the obscure,—these are the essential elements of intellectual power, whether in the orator or in the writer. The smooth flow of diction, the melody of intonation, the gracefulness of gesture, and the prettiness of fancy, are well enough, but in the action and col-

lision of mind, they are no more than the plumage on the helmet of the warrior in the whirlwind of battle.

Here we must be allowed to throw in a word in behalf of a once honored, but now too neglected art, which Dr. Beecher, though in his heart he loves it, seems almost ready to abandon to the enemy. The science and art of logic, exalted out of measure in the blind idolatry of the schoolmen, and dishonored by their trifling, is naturally enough despised by a generation who imagine it to be their prerogative to argue without regarding the laws of thought, or the principles according to which truth is connected with truth. But with all due deference to this generation, and with unfeigned respect for the great and wise, by whose suffrages the dialectic art and science has been excluded from our systems of education, we plead for logic, for the old logic, stripped, if you please, of its scholastic follies, and suited to the present state of human knowledge. That logic, rightly understood, is simply the art of discrimination, definition, analysis, and inference, reduced to theory and system. No other instrument can be like it for training the mind to sharpness of discrimination. Nothing else can so teach disputants to define the point about which they debate, or to detect each other in errors of statement or fallacy of argument, or to bring each other back to the question, when either is changing his position in the confusion and smoke of the conflict. It was almost exclusively the study of this school logic, in its connection with theology, which constituted the education of Baxter. He testifies, that "he plunged himself very early into the study of controversies, and read all the schoolmen he could get; for," says he, "next to practical divinity, no books so suited with my disposition as Aquinas, Scotus, Durandus, Ockham, and their disciples. I could never from my first studies endure confusion. Till equivocals were explained, and definition and distinction led the way, I had rather hold my tongue than speak! And I was never more weary of learned men's discourses, than when I heard them long wrangling about unexpounded words or things, and eagerly disputing before they understood each other's minds, and vehemently asserting *modes*, and *consequents*, and *adjuncts*, before they considered the *quod sit*, or the *quid sit*, or the *quotuplex*. I never thought I understood a thing till I could anatomize it, and see the parts distinctly, and the conjunction of the parts as they make up the whole. Distinction and method seemed to me of that necessity, that without them I could not be said to know; and the disputes which forsook them, or abused them, seemed but as incoherent dreams."* Would that all the theologians of our day had been trained after such a fashion. It would be pleasant to

* Baxter's Life, lib. i. p. 6.

hold a discussion with such men on the question, whether sin is in any instance preferable in God's estimation to holiness. What the pleadings are, in the trial of a case at law, just that the dialectic art was in the management of a controversy; it did not always bring the controversy to an end, but it did enable the parties and the umpires to see precisely where and what the controversy was.

But should not college education be made, to some extent at least, more practical? Should not each student be at liberty to pursue those branches of knowledge which are most directly connected with the profession to which he is destined? We answer, peremptorily, No. The very design of colleges is to give a liberal, as distinct from a professional education. In most minds the tendency of professional studies, is to seclude the individual from the world, to shut him up in a certain circle of technical ideas and professional habits of thought, and to make him even a stranger in the great commonwealth of letters. A liberal education, preparatory to the commencement of such studies as belong to a profession, is therefore, in the highest and truest meaning of the words, a practical education; for it is the only way of giving to the mind enlargement of views and habits of correct judgment, of guarding it beforehand against becoming the slave of technicalities, and of making the man an enlightened citizen, a man of knowledge and taste and mental refinement, instead of merely an intellectual artisan. The liberal education preliminary to professional study, is what makes the learned professions worthy to be called liberal. Who can estimate how much is gained in respect to the illumination, the peace, and the moral improvement of our country, by the fraternity which this system tends to maintain among intellectual men of various employments. Who can fail to see, that the wider the domain of thought and knowledge, which these men have traversed together and occupy in common, the more salutary will be their influence upon each other and upon the nation? What would be the effect of putting the aspirants to the various professions upon distinct and professional courses of study, from the commencement of what is now called college education? Let the ministry, for example, be trained exclusively in schools of theology; let them have no liberal education in common with educated lawyers and physicians; and how would their influence in society be weakened, and the influence of men in other professions be perverted; how soon would preachers of the gospel, ignorant of every thing not in the line of their profession, be the objects of unfeigned and undisguised contempt with infidel barristers and materialist practitioners of medicine? It is the liberalizing influence of a liberal education, conjoined with the reminiscences and associations of college life, that keeps many a

medical man and many a legal man from sheer infidelity, and finally perhaps brings him under the saving influence of the truth.

Admitting, however, that the college system needs not to be made more practical, is it not deficient in respect to religious influence? Undoubtedly there should be more of the spirit of religion, more holiness, in all our colleges, as well as every where else in this sinful world. Undoubtedly more ought to be done by the guardians and teachers of these institutions, if they can but ascertain what to do, to promote an intelligent, fervent, self-denying piety among the young men committed to their care. But as for the idea so often thrown out, that college studies and habits, and college rules, are peculiarly unfavorable to piety, we do not admit it; we utterly reject it. Where are revivals of religion more frequent, more powerful, more blessed and lasting in their fruits, than in those colleges which are under an evangelical influence? Where are we to find the parents and guardians who watch over the spiritual welfare of young men, more devoutly and wisely than the officers of such institutions watch and pray and labor for the salvation of the young men in colleges? Where are professed christians more abundant in social prayer, more faithful in mutual watchfulness, more active in efforts to persuade and save their companions and friends, than the pious young men in colleges? It is false, it is dishonorable to the gospel to suppose, that the culture of the intellectual powers, the acquisition of knowledge, the close application of the mind to study, must needs be unfavorable to piety. We have heard of a young man who, having a great desire to preach, began to study, and immediately gave it up because his Latin grammar was not spiritual;—but we never thought any better of his piety for his censure on the grammar. If there are those who would have spirituality the sum and substance of all college exercises, or who would forego the culture of the mind for the sake of giving to young men a four-years course of religious exhortation, we cannot but regard their ideas respecting the nature of piety, as being not many degrees more sound or enlightened, than the ideas of those whose mistaken though fervent devotion introduced into the church the system of monkery with all its mischiefs. He who is to be “fervent in spirit, serving the Lord,” must needs be “not slothful in business;” and those who would let down the standard of scholarship, or relax the constancy or vigor of intellectual discipline, for the sake of promoting piety, will find in the end, that such a policy is adverse to the interests not only of piety but of morals.

This, we shall be told, is not what is desired by those who complain of the want of religious influences in colleges. What do they mean then? Do they suppose, that christianity has no

authority, no name or being in our literary institutions; and is it such a deficiency, that they are seeking to supply? But is there a college this side of Charlottesville, in which the students are not assembled morning and evening, like members of a christian family, for the reading of the scriptures and for prayer in the name of Christ? Is there one in which the evidences of christianity are not studied as essential to a liberal education, or in which the study of moral philosophy is conducted without a constant reference to the authority of the christian scriptures as an infallible rule of duty? Is not the professor of divinity a regular member of the academic corps of teachers; and has he not at least one day in seven exclusively devoted to his department; and is he not expected to conduct all his teaching with a view to make his pupils christians, in understanding, in practice, in experience?

Dr. Beecher argues eloquently, that the bible should be made a classic in the colleges. We are far from controverting his position, as he understands it and argues for it. We doubt not, that in some way a course of biblical lessons, to be studied and recited like other lessons, might be advantageously incorporated with the scheme of study in every college. Yet every man who knows any thing of the practical difficulties in the management of a college, may see, that to conduct a class successfully and profitably through such a course of task-lessons, must require either peculiar skill on the part of the teacher, or peculiar docility on the part of the pupils. Bible-classes in colleges, as elsewhere, are commonly formed and managed on "the voluntary principle." It may be a question after all, whether it is not the more excellent way to make attendance on such exercises voluntary with the student; whether the study of the bible should not be encouraged rather than enforced by the college government; and whether to use the bible as a classic might not be, in too many instances, to degrade it rather than to honor it.

But should not more attention be given to physical education? This is an exceedingly popular topic of discourse; and no new institution, literary or theological, has ventured to demand public aid, within a few years past, till it could point to its farm or its workshops, and ring the changes on the neglect of physical education. Of all these institutions, that over which Dr. Beecher presides has been, without parallel, the most successful in the way of manual labor. It is very natural for him, therefore, to favor the manual labor system. Manual labor is very well; but we confess our doubts, whether it can well be incorporated with the system of liberal education. We suspect, that generally the funds given to endow manual labor departments are given to little purpose. The discussion of the subject at large would carry us far beyond the

limits we have assigned to this article ; and therefore we will content ourselves with the statement of a few leading principles in respect to physical education.

1. Physical education is the education of the body for its appropriate functions in the complex economy of human life.

2. The work of physical education is chiefly negative, or rather preventive. If the body is guarded against disease,—if the causes of disease, such as filth, unwholesome food, and perilous exposure, are avoided, and disease itself, when it occurs, is treated with judicious remedies, nature will ordinarily do the rest. To educate the mind, to develop and discipline its faculties, is a work requiring great skill and diligence ; but nature, if she be not violated, educates the body. The teeth, both in the first growth and the second, like Dogberry's reading and writing, " come by nature." The stomach and the bowels, if not abused, need no schoolmaster to make them do their office. The muscular system, the osseous system, the nervous system, all grow as naturally as a cabbage. Physical education, then, consists essentially in letting nature do her own work.

3. " Physical education should be commenced in the family." It belongs chiefly to the family. The mother, the father, and such as supply the place of mother and father, must take the human animal in its earliest years, and see that no malignant influences, or disastrous habits, implant in the constitution the seeds of disease.

4. " The body was made for action, and it cannot with impunity, either by violence or stealth, be cheated out of it."

5. Starvation will not answer instead of bodily exercise. " The only safe way is to give nature her portion of meat in due season, so combined with exercise, as to secure to the digestive organs an untiring vigor in the right performance of their work."

6. There is in the constitution of human nature a great power of adaptation to circumstances. If the human animal grows up in circumstances requiring great muscular strength, the constitution adapts itself to the exigency. The sailor, accustomed to look out inquiringly over the wide expanse, acquires great compass of vision ; while the proof-reader grows quick-sighted and short-sighted. Thus the body can be trained to endure a great amount of any particular kind of exertion, without being able to endure a similar amount of another kind. Thus, too, the various portions of the system will develop themselves according to the amount of action required of them.

7. In order to the complete physical education of a student, it is not necessary, that he be trained to great muscular strength, or great acuteness of the senses, but only to complete health. The development which he wants, is of intellectual not of muscular

power,—of the brain, the organ of thought, not of the power of sight or hearing. He may have the brawny shoulders of a porter, or the sinewy arms of a blacksmith, and be none the more able to contend in the strife of mind with mind. He may have the far-reaching ken of a sailor, and see none the better on that account into the dim distances of history and philosophy; or he may have the microscopic eye of a professional proof-reader, and be none the more able to split hairs in metaphysics. All that he needs in this respect, is a body in which the action of all the organs is regular and healthful.

8. The exhaustion consequent upon intellectual effort, is a weariness of the body and not of the soul, and is occasioned, if we may so speak, by the expenditure of vital power in the action of the brain. If therefore we add to that weariness the weariness consequent upon any other kind of labor, we only draw more largely on the living energy of the system.

9. "Of all drudgery, that of being compelled to exercise merely for the sake of exercising is the greatest."

10. The division of labor being the first element of civilization, and essential to excellence in any department of labor, it is not to be expected, save perhaps in some few extraordinary cases, that the same man will be a skillful mechanic and a good scholar. He who attempts to be both, will probably be neither.

11. "All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy." Every one who works, needs not merely change of work, but relaxation, diversion, play, to exhilarate and refresh. Manual labor in a mechanic's shop may be very good play to those who have a taste for such amusements, but work done in play is not worth much in the market.

12. The instinctive desire of muscular action, if it has free scope, will prompt to as much bodily exercise as is essential to health. A child will play without being taught. The school-boy will play enough, without being driven to it. The young man in college will play with his fellows at one athletic game and another, till some false ideas of propriety, of manliness, or of gentility, take possession of his mind, and he undertakes to put away childish things.

13. The great security for health in sedentary men, is cheerfulness, a constant vivacity of mind, that will not stoop to fretfulness or anxiety. That convulsive motion of the diaphragm, sometimes called laughter, is an excellent promoter of digestion; and when the mind unbends itself in sport, and laughter fills the soul, the machinery of the system is unconsciously winding itself up for renewed action. The anxious man, who cannot take things contentedly, as they are ordered or permitted in God's providence;

the man who is too gloomy or too stately to be heartily amused, and whose laughter is only superficial, never shaking up his system, never surpassing the decorum of a smile like that of Cassius, is the man to grow dyspeptic, to read one author after another on diet and digestion, to wear himself down to a shadow with laborious bodily exercise that profiteth little, and finally to present himself to the public as a mournful example of the neglect of physical education.

14. If a student has been bred to manual labor, for example to some mechanic art, it may ordinarily be wise for him to mingle such labor with study, at least in the earlier stages of his education; and that, not only because a sudden and entire change in his habits may be fatal to his constitution, but because the avails of his strength and skill may afford him important aid in respect to the expenses of his education.

15. No college, except in very extraordinary circumstances, can be expected to employ its pupils in agricultural or mechanical labors without great pecuniary loss. We need not go into the theory of this. Probably the experience of those institutions who have given to the scheme a fair and full trial, if frankly communicated to the public, would supersede the necessity of any theoretical exposition. If the student who has strength and skill for labor, cannot find profitable employment in some of the gardens or workshops constantly demanding labor within a mile of the college, his college, we may be sure, cannot find it for him by setting up workshops or laying out gardens.

16. It is not true, at least it is yet to be proved, that students in colleges are, on the whole, more subject to bodily ailments, than young men of the same age in workshops and manufactories. How many of the students in a college are persons for whom a sedentary life was chosen, simply or chiefly because of the feebleness of their physical frame. If a father or a mother is to select one son out of the family to be sent to college, upon which one will the choice fall? Upon that stout sunburnt boy, who never had a sick day, and whose strong arm will soon be so helpful? or upon that delicate child, doubly dear to his mother for the painful hours, that she spent over his cradle, and for the constant watchfulness, that is necessary to keep him from sickness whenever he has been exposed to rain or cold? Which is most likely to be a lover of his book,—he whose voice is the loudest in the ring, whose foot is the fleetest in the race, and whose joyous consciousness of muscular energy makes him ambitious for labor? or that gentle boy who, while his brothers, in the exuberance of life, are scuffling and leaping, lies in the grass weaving his green chain of dandelion stalks? What sort of a boy was Beattie's Edwin?

"Concourse, and noise, and toil, he ever fled,
Nor cared to mingle in the clamorous fray
Of squabbling imps :"—
"Th' exploit of strength, dexterity or speed,
To him nor vanity nor joy could bring ;"

and why? Why because he was a boy of delicate frame, not made for powerful muscular action, and eminently susceptible of disease. Nothing is more natural, than that more than an average share of such boys should find their way to college. These are the Polloks and the Kirk Whites, in whom disease becomes the stimulus of genius, and whose light burning with unnatural brightness burns out and dies. "Whom the gods love, die young;" not for the want of manual labor in colleges, but because such is the law of nature. Yet, so far as our observation goes, the young men in college, taken as a body, are not, on the whole, more liable to disease and death than young men in other employments.

Our doctrine is then, that the less colleges have to do with manual labor departments, the better for their pupils, and the better for the cause of education and sound learning. It is to another sort of improvement, that colleges are called in these days, when the intellect of the people, stimulated by freedom and the diffusion of knowledge, is every where waking up; when new ideas are pervading all orders in society; and when there is, consequently, an increased necessity for a large class of minds, prepared by thorough discipline as well as by native power, to lead and control the growing excitement and energies of the popular intellect.

'While with such liberal hand our public institutions dispense their treasures of knowledge, and wake up around themselves the insulated energies of talented minds, the laws of self-preservation demand, that by double diligence they hold their relative eminences, to prevent the faltering of public confidence, and literary pedantry in single departments, and the filling of the land with half-made, self-made, self-willed ultra men, conflicting with common-sense and one another, and united only in their contempt of a regular education, and their eulogies of modern mental supremacy and a short meter course. While the mass of mind rises, and coruscations of self-taught mind break out and dazzle, and do wonders, our colleges and seminaries must rise above all heights of successful competition, to command respect and hold back society from feverish effervescences as it approaches to an elevated standard of universal culture; and wo to the republic when our colleges,—those orbs of intellectual day, shall fail to command respect, and by the formation of mind and morals, to disseminate knowledge and holiness through the land.' pp. 32, 33.

How ought colleges to be constituted and governed? We will not speak here of the best mode of guarding the endowments of a college from waste or perversion, and of securing the appointment of able instructors; we will only advert to this single aspect

of the question,—shall the students be governed by law and authority, or shall they be governed by their own will and wisdom? The question seems to admit of but one answer. Yet the general relaxation of domestic discipline, the disorganizing ideas of liberty which from so many sources are distilled into the minds of the young, and the crisis which is so fast developing in the history of this nation, give to this question a most serious importance. Our colleges must maintain a perfect subordination, or their influence will be disastrous. The first lesson of the student must be that of subordination to the rule of law and of those whom the law sets over him. Otherwise he will be educated to be not an orb of light wheeling in its appointed track, but an erratic star, full of malignant influences.

‘This tendency of personal liberty to the subversion of laws, is with us the epidemic of the day. The genius of our government has breathed a spirit of relaxation through all our systems of education from the cradle upward. Instead of increasing the efficiency of early discipline and habits of subordination through every form of social preparatory government, we have thrown the reins presumptuously upon the neck of childhood and youth, trusting to the efficiency of law to meet and curb and tame their fiery insubordination. In our contempt of the arbitrary inequalities of monarchical governments, our zeal has overacted to the overthrow of those constitutional distinctions of intelligence, and virtue, and authority, inseparable from the existence of well regulated society.

Instead of environing the rising generations with paternal vigilance and a mild efficient government, to qualify them by habit for coming responsibilities, we have blamed the severity of our fathers, and ridiculed their particularity, and in the supremacy of our wisdom, sent our children, ungoverned at home, to meet the responsibilities of the school, of the college, and of public life. And they, rocked to sleep in the nursery by the songs and eulogies of liberty, deem it an unseemly indignity to their native independence, to be compelled to obey, and their young republican blood makes insurrection, and the wise, weak-hearted parent submits; hoping they will be ashamed of their conduct when they come to years of discretion—an era which few ungoverned children ever reach. The same unsubdued spirit of republican independence goes murmuring through the common school with oft repeated breakings out of a rebellious will. The academy sometimes conquers and sometimes is conquered—sometimes compromises, or concedes a truce; while in the college with increasing frequency it attempts the subjugation of the powers that be, to the popular will.

In the meantime our patriotic politicians—and never was a nation blessed with such a multitude of them—have so long and so constantly assured the sovereign people of their power, and their own implicit subjection to them, that they have taken it into their heads to be above not only their servants, but above themselves—as acting by their own officers and their own laws; so that by the deceitful influence of our

institutions, that efficiency of government, and those habits of subordination, so indispensable to qualify us for spontaneous obedience to law, are fast failing; and the law is called to disclose its impotency to control a population from abroad and at home, furious in passion, haughty in pride, and indomitable in will. The result is, that in the absence of the power, and in contempt of the dignity of law, brawls and assaults and batteries, in high places and low, and duels and assassinations, and robberies, and conflagrations, and murders, and mobs, and treasons, and all the symptoms of a fast approaching dissolution, begin to appear.

The truth is, we are fast going down stream, with all the accelerating power of passion, wind, and tide; **AND UNLESS THE NATION CAN BE AWAKENED, WE SHALL GO DOWN.**⁷ pp. 41, 43.

To what extent should colleges be multiplied? We answer, they should be multiplied just so far as is necessary in order to all the benefits of competition. The competition among rival institutions, is not only, as we have already hinted, the great stimulus to improvement, but also the great security against deterioration and corruption. But beyond that point at which the benefits of free competition are made sure, it is not good economy on the part of the christian public to endow new colleges. Nay, it is a positive evil, when the multiplication of colleges prevents that concentration of endowments and of public interest and affection, which is necessary in order that each may be adequately furnished and sustained. A multitude of starveling institutions, without apparatus, without libraries, without funds, without students in such numbers as to permit a proper division of labor among the instructors, must operate only to bring down the standard of liberal education. Yet peculiar circumstances may sometimes make it necessary to endow a college on a territory which is already nominally supplied. The institution which pre-occupies the ground may be incurably defective in its constitution,—it may be a State institution, forever in the hands of intriguing politicians,—it may be an institution from which evangelical influence is hopelessly excluded. Such an institution it may be good economy to supplant rather than to endure; and commonly such an institution is easily supplanted, or at least paralyzed. But when such is the object, let the object be plainly and manfully avowed. Let not the new institution be got up under the plea of reforming the whole system of education. Let it involve no preposterous and perilous project of a self-supporting institute, which demands aid *because* it can support itself; or of a great miscellaneous combination of things, the infant school and the theological seminary, the college and the female institute, men and babes, youths and maidens, all dwelling together in love, a beautiful spectacle of mutual instruction and mutual refinement. Let the great and satisfactory reason for getting up the supernumerary institution be openly avowed.

Let it be said out, The college on this ground is too corrupt, too hopeless of reform to be endured ; and we intend to put it down. Then, if the case can be made out to the satisfaction of the christian public, the requisite funds will be given intelligently and cheerfully.

Our remarks thus far have taken no notice of that which we regard as the ablest and most valuable portion of Dr. Beecher's discourse, and it is now too late to dwell upon what we have passed by. We will only say, that the few pages which he occupies with a discussion of the proper design and end of liberal education, are worthy to be studied once a month by every young man who enjoys the privilege of cultivating his mind for future action on the minds of his fellow-men. Through that discussion, and indeed throughout the whole discourse, are thickly scattered those gems of brilliant and solid thought,—diamonds carelessly thrown from the mine,—which so characterize all the writings of this author. No writer of this age so abounds in striking apothegms, strikingly expressed, each of which might be the theme of a volume. We have marked a few specimens ; and with these we dismiss the subject.

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES.

‘The depths and the accuracy of science are but the development of his handy work, whose wisdom is in all, and over all ; and no man can understand any science, or any thing, who cannot lay his hand on the elementary principles, and by the light of these, trace out the relations and dependences of the whole.’ p. 9.

IMPORTANCE OF PRECISION OF THOUGHT.

‘It is this precision of knowledge which it is the business of literary and theological institutions to communicate, and of their inmates to acquire—and without it not only are the blessings of an education lost, but the multiplied evils of undisciplined minds—of indefinite conceptions and fallacious reasonings—and the bewilderment of a declamatory flippancy of specious words is poured out upon society with an overflowing flood, sweeping away the landmarks of truth and principles, and covering the surface with brush, and leaves and gravel.’ p. 10.

CONDENSATION OF THOUGHT.

‘Thought must have light and power to produce effect—and this can be accomplished only by condensation—and this, only by close and clear thinking, and careful and reiterated revision.’ p. 13.

NATIVE ELOQUENCE.

‘There is no native eloquence, more than there is native running races or fighting battles. It is the result of the best order of mind, with all sorts of the best training.’ p. 15.

VALUE OF KNOWLEDGE ACQUIRED BY INVESTIGATION.

'That which is committed to the memory may be forgotten ; but that which is seen and handled of truth is inseparable from the mind's being, and is the ground of its future and eternal progress.' p. 19.

WHENCE COMES ELOQUENCE ?

'It is not the dilatory precision of thought and words, stored up in memory, which qualifies mind for its high action in victorious elocution ; but the electric flash of thought, and the broad circumference of illuminated vision, filled with words for perspicuity, precision, strength or beauty, and familiar by use, offering every where and constantly their willing aid—a body-guard clustering by affinity and affection unseen around the orator, as guardian spirits attend the saints—auxiliaries which no art can enlist, no mercenary motive secure, and which come only by long and oft-repeated communings with the mighty dead of other tongues and other days. It is not memory, it is not art ; it is the habit of the soul,—its quick perceptions, refined taste and feeling, around which the symbols of thought rally when its high inspirations come on, and it goes forth in its victorious career. Like spirits from the vasty deep, they come clustering about its path on flaming wing, offering their welcome aid.' p. 30.

ART. V.—CHARACTERISTICS OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY.

The Great Teacher ; Characteristics of our Lord's Ministry. By the Rev. JOHN HARRIS. With an introductory essay, by HEMAN HUMPHREYS, D. D., President of Amherst College. Amherst: J. S. & C. Adams. 1836.

THIS is a volume of 430 pages, recently reprinted at Amherst, Mass., from the original English work, also of recent date, with an introduction from the pen of the president of Amherst College. From this introduction of president Humphrey, we will copy a short extract, designed to give a compendious view of the contents and character of the book before us.

'The author of the present work, is the pastor of an independent church, in Epsom, Eng. ; and is 'well reported of by the brethren.' It being his object in this volume, to bring us directly to Christ, for divine instruction, he entitles it, **THE GREAT TEACHER**. The book contains five Essays, of considerable length, and on the following important topics. I. *The authority of our Lord's teaching.* II. *The originality of our Lord's teaching*, under seven distinct heads. III. *The spirituality of our Lord's teaching.* IV. *On the tenderness and benevolence of our Lord's teaching.* V. *The practicalness of our Lord's teaching.* In reading these Essays, I have been exceedingly interested, as I am sure every person must be, who is pleased to find weighty and well-digested thoughts, imbued with deep christian feeling, and clothed in perspicuous and polished language. Mr. Harris is a writer of much more than ordinary intellectual powers and cultivation.

He writes like one who has long been accustomed to 'sit at the feet of Jesus,' and has eminently profited under his teaching. Instead of asking what other men have thought of *The Great Teacher*, and borrowing their opinions to help make out a respectable volume, he has evidently heard for himself; and he gives us his own impressions vividly and forcibly, just as he received them. Such a book as this is not often written before the meridian of life, and never either before or after, without deep and protracted meditation.' pp. xvi. xvii.

We have certainly not read this book without interest, nor, as we trust, without some degree of profit; but, perhaps, owing to some fault in ourselves, we must confess, that we have not experienced quite all that interest or profit which the nature of the theme, and the strength of the commendation bestowed upon the work, led us to anticipate. The work is indeed original, and contains many new and striking thoughts. It is the production of a vigorous mind. It is in the main correct in point of orthodoxy; and its subject matter will of course insure for it among the pious an extended circulation. But we did not ourselves feel all that intensity of interest, in the reading of it, which we had expected to feel. There are intrinsic and very serious difficulties in handling such a theme. The imagination of the writer is apt to become so warmed by dwelling upon our Lord's character, (where all is so wonderful and so captivating,) as to leave the mind in a measure unfitted for that calm, collected, and minute contemplation of particulars in our Lord's life and actions, which is so essential to a distinct and powerful impression. A splendor and a redundancy of imagery is apt to be employed by the writer to express the struggling conceptions and emotions of his soul, the effect of which is to prevent, still further, definiteness and clearness of apprehension respecting the things of which he treats. And besides all this, in contemplating our Lord's character, we feel that we are not contemplating simply an exhibition of *human* actions and *human* propensities, but that there is mysteriously combined with them something which is infinitely superior to what appropriately belongs to human nature. This very fact, tends still farther to embarrass the mind in respect to the clearness of its perceptions, and to beget confusion and fatigue in the mind of others, where it attempts to transfer its own impressions to them. These remarks are designed to explain, and we think they do so, at least in part, the leading defects of the work before us. The mind of the author was evidently and strongly excited by the very nature of his subject. His imagination was kindled to the highest pitch. As he dwelt upon the inspiring theme, he found his thoughts instinctively borne away into a region of comparative obscurity, where all is vast and sublime, unearthly and incomprehensible; and here images, rather than distinct and sober views of reality, crowd-

ed upon him in rapid succession and irresistible power; and he has spread them out before us, or rather poured them out, in the wild confusion and vagueness in which they offered themselves to his own mind. A paragraph or two will illustrate our meaning, and at the same time exhibit the author's bold and fervid manner of writing. For this purpose we have selected the following from the section on "Satanic agency."

'For ages previous to the divine advent, the world seemed almost entirely his own. His contest for earthly supremacy, so long disputed by heaven, seemed crowned with success. His vice-regencies and powers sat in the quiet and unchallenged possession of their thrones. No prophet smote them on their lofty seat, or denounced their usurpations; no miracle reminded them of an omnipotent antagonist. The world appeared to be as completely theirs, to portion out and rule at pleasure, as if they held it by grant and seal from God himself, and were appointed to reign in his name. Nor did Judea itself form an exception to this wide infernal sway; for (short of *formal* idolatry) it belonged to the universal confederacy, and formed one of the fairest and most faithful provinces of the Satanic empire. And, as if to exact a terrible compensation, even for this slight nominal deduction from full allegiance, many of its inhabitants were held as hostages to hell, by a terrible system of demoniacal possession. Satan had become 'the prince of this world.' Wherever he looked the expanse was his own; the teeming population were his subjects; the invisible rulers were his selected agents; temptation in his hands had become a science, and sin was taught by rule; the world was one storehouse of temptation; an armory in which every object and event ranked as a weapon, and all classed and kept ready for service: every human heart was a fortified place: every demon power was at its post: he beheld the complicated machinery of evil, which his mighty malignity had constructed, in full and efficient operation; no heart unoccupied, no spot unvisited, no agency unemployed; and the whole resulting in a vast, organized and consolidated empire. No sooner, therefore, did Jesus begin to attract the attention of Judea, as the 'Sent of God,' than he became obnoxious to the tyrant's hate. In the usurped capacity of the sovereign of the world the tempter went forth and met him, asking him only to own that sovereignty, and all the kingdoms of the world should be his, and the glory of them.' * * * * *

'Now, as Satan possesses on earth official ubiquity, as he is every where present through the medium of his agent, it was not to be supposed that an event so signalized as the advent of Christ would escape his knowledge; or, that being known, it would fail to call forth his jealous vigilance and utmost opposition. Knowing, indeed, as *we* do, the essential dignity of Christ, we might have hoped that, in deference to his purity and majesty, temptation would have retired from his presence, or have laid its baneful activity to sleep; that the powers of darkness would have left him a free and open passage through the world: and that his disciples would have found in his hallowed presence a certain shelter from the persecutions of hell. But, so far from this, his

coming awoke all the original antipathy, the native oppugnancy, of evil against good. He had come into a world in which nothing in human form had ever escaped the pollution of sin ; and he had come here, attested by such signal credentials of a divine commission, that from the hour of advent, through the whole of his earthly course, Satan appears to have called in his agents from every other pursuit, and to have set them in array against him alone ; turning away from all ignoble prey, he seems to have made him the sole mark for every shaft and weapon of hell. As if the temptation of Christ were too great an enterprise, a field too momentous, to be left to the power of a common arm, the prince of darkness, himself, undertook personally to conduct the untried adventure. Having drawn out his forces, and intrenched himself in his way, he came into eager and determined collision with Christ on the very threshold of his public life ; leaving him to infer, that if he persisted in his intended course, his progress would be disputed, step by step.

* * * * *

‘We cannot but imagine that the thrones and principalities of darkness were there to witness the triumph ; that, flocking together from the east and west, the north and south, leaving behind them many an unfinished plot of evil, they came and covered the mount to celebrate his triumph. And could heaven be absent ? No : the angels of God, incapable of repose while such an issue was pending, quitted their celestial seats, and surrounded the scene with horses and chariots of fire. Stars in their courses might have fought during that hour, and have been unheeded. It was more than an era ; the junction of all the eras of time : the event of that hour was to determine, whether earth should pass entirely into the hands of Satan, or be again recovered into the hand of God : whether the expiring rays of human hope should be quite extinguished in the blood of Christ, leaving the earth in hopeless night ; or, whether his cross should henceforth radiate light and life to the universe : it was to draw to a close the great question, to terminate the comprehensive controversy of all ages between right and wrong, holiness and sin. Hell inflicted the decisive stroke ; the shock was received and sustained by the heart of the Son of God. Then, and not till then, did the powers of darkness perceive their error : they saw with unutterable dismay, that in bowing his head he was dragging the pillars of their empire to the dust ; that he was dying to triumph ; that, in effect, his cross was changing into a throne. He exclaimed, ‘It is finished !’ and the gates of hell vibrated to the shout. He entered into the grave for a short space ; there attired himself in the robes of triumph ; came forth to receive the gratulation and homage of angels and men ; and ascended to his new mediatorial throne, ‘leading captivity captive, and making a show of them openly.’” pp. 221—226.

We dismiss the work with a single additional remark respecting it. It is very much disfigured with frequent errors, and even with the grossest blunders, in printing. This is altogether inexcusable in an edition which is taken from a previously *printed* copy, as this edition was. It evinces a degree of carelessness

and haste, for which, in the execution of such a work, no sufficient apology can be made. This remark might be extended to many other books printed in this country, especially those belonging to the popular literature of the day. They are hurried before the public bearing too many marks of negligence, not to say of slovenliness, in the style of their execution, and particularly in respect to their typography. The cover is perhaps sufficiently adorned and tasteful, and the paper is fine enough and good enough, but the department of the compositor is wretchedly performed, and the lax vigilance exercised in the revision of proof sheets, leaves the process of correction a work of easy performance, and soon dispatched. The book must be got before the public as expeditiously as it can be; and it must be as cheap as it can be; no matter for the rest. Fortunately, much of the popular literature of the day may as well be issued from the press in this way as any other; its typographical inaccuracies and blunders will, upon the whole, do little disservice to the cause of letters; for the less it is read, the greater the benefit to the public. But not so with regard to a work so serious and so elevated in its character and object as that now before us. Every thing, however inconsiderable in itself, which detracts from the value of such a work, or circumscribes its influence, or hinders its circulation, is to be regretted and ought to be avoided.

The work before us will furnish a proper occasion for suggesting some reflections of our own, on the character of our Redeemer *as a teacher of moral truth*, and on the subject generally of *communicating moral instruction to mankind*, by whomsoever that office may be discharged. In treating of a subject so important and so difficult as the one which is here proposed, we shall aim to bring forward, for the most part, *suggestions* only, designed to awaken and guide the reflections of others on a deeply interesting topic; not to put forth, dogmatically, any views of our own. And even in doing this, we feel no small self-diffidence at entering upon our task. We feel afraid of penning a single sentence, on a subject of such vast importance, without pondering well the exact impressions which it is fitted to produce on the minds of our readers. The office of communicating instruction to others, on the great themes of morality and religion, is one which involves relations and consequences of a most solemn character. It stands in immediate contact with the highest interests of man in this world, and with all that is delightful and awful in the retributions of the future. Well for us is it, therefore, that we have, in the teaching of our Savior, an example of perfect excellence and unquestionable authority, to guide us in this responsible and difficult employment. A few remarks may serve to bring his example more distinctly and fully into view.

The Savior's peculiar excellence as a teacher, is observable in his keeping close in his instructions to a few great fundamental *principles*. These principles are alike applicable in all ages and to all people, because they are founded in the nature of man, and in the relations which he sustains to the universe around him. Among these principles we may dwell particularly upon the following :

1. *That there is a right and a wrong in the very nature of man's moral actions, aside from all the requirements or prohibitions of law on the subject.* This principle has, in every age, been denied by some. Acute and learned men have gravely contended, that the right and the wrong in human conduct, are only the result of legislation or of certain conventional usages among men, and not at all founded in the unchangeable and everlasting nature of things. From hence the bold deduction has been drawn, that there is no such thing as moral rectitude, other than what the will of the ruler or the mere circumstances of the case have created such ; and that there is no such thing as sin or moral evil, other than what in the same way has been constituted such. Now our Savior, in his instructions to mankind, every where assumes, that one course of action is right and its opposite is wrong, prior to all positive requirement or prohibition in the case, and independently of all the circumstances of time, place, or persons concerned. He has nowhere attempted to prove, but has always assumed it as self-evident, that it is right to love God, to serve him, to seek his favor, and deprecate his displeasure by prayer ; that it is wrong and wicked not to love God, and not to serve him, and not to seek his favor and deprecate his displeasure by prayer ; that it is right to love our neighbor, and to seek his happiness ; that it is wrong to hate our neighbor, or to neglect the promotion of his happiness, whenever it is in our power ; that it is right to speak the truth, and to "do justly and love mercy," and that the opposite of these things is in each case wrong, evil, wicked, deserving of God's displeasure, and sure to meet with it ; that it is right to repent of sin when it has been committed, and wrong not to repent of it ; that it is right that men should repent of their sins *now*, just so soon as they know themselves to be sinners, and wrong that they should remain another day or hour impenitent. So in a great variety of other particulars that might be specified. Our Savior does not go back into any abstract reasoning to prove, that these and other right things in human conduct *are* right, or that these and other wrong things in human conduct *are* wrong. He assumes the right and the wrong in the case, as being self-evident, and as what no reasoning can make plainer. Upon this ground he proceeds to prohibit and condemn the wrong, and to approve and enjoin the right ; to threaten punishment to

the wicked, and to encourage the righteous with assurances of his favor, just as if he had established the question of their guilt or innocence by argument and the formal adduction of evidence. In pursuing this course our Savior manifestly acted the part of wisdom; for all men, in the exercise of common-sense, know, that there is a distinction between right and wrong in human actions: this is a first principle; God has written it on the heart of man; and man's intellect must be strangely perverted to call it in question. Any teacher of moral truth, who would make much impression and do good to the souls of men by his teaching, ought to keep close to this principle. By departing from it, and by suffering the fact of an eternal distinction between right and wrong, virtue and vice, holiness and sin to be called in question; he will only dilute and weaken all that he says, in attempting to persuade others to a holy life. When the mind comes to take the ground of such a denial, (if the mind of man can truly take this ground,) little hope can remain of doing it any good. The subject of such a delusion may better be left to the silent operations of his own conscience and common-sense to set him right.

2. Another first-principle in morals to which our Lord always adhered in his instructions to the people, is, *that whatever is known to be right is always to be practiced, and whatever is known to be wrong is always to be avoided, let the consequences be what they may.* It will often happen, that by doing right great present evil will be induced, as the probable, perhaps certain, consequence; and by doing wrong great good will seem likely, perhaps certainly to follow in its train. This will constitute, of course, a strong temptation to choose the wrong and refuse the right in practice, that is, to "do evil that good may come." Such a temptation, in a given case, will exert a potent influence to blind the mind to the distinction between right and wrong; and thus, there will be much danger, lest the right will be rejected, and the wrong pursued, on the ground, that in this way the greater good will be secured. Hence the question of mere *expediency* rather than of *right and wrong* in the case may and does become, to thousands, the governing consideration, and they act accordingly. Now our blessed Lord always proceeded on the ground, that what was clearly known to be right was to be done, and what was wrong was to be avoided, let consequences be as they might; that in such a case we have no authority to make the apprehended consequences of our actions to ourselves the measure of our study in respect to their performance; that we must do right, and leave consequences to God. For example; is it right to obey God rather than men? Then we are not to withhold obedience because it might subject us, in certain cases, to personal suffering and even to all the pains and penalties of legalized and violent persecution. Is it right, (*in foro*

conscientiæ, and according to the clear decisions of the word of God,) that men should give of their substance to send the gospel to the destitute? Then the personal sacrifice which this exercise of beneficence to their fellow-men may cost them, is no reason why the duty in question should be neglected. If it is a duty, and conscience and the word of God say that it is so; it is of course to be performed, to whatever unpleasant consequences, mediate or immediate, *in* the performance or *after* the performance, it may subject us. So on the other hand, if any given practice is wrong, and we know or believe it to be so, from that practice, whatever it be, we are to abstain, let the consequences of yielding to it be as alluring as they may, and the consequences of abstaining from it as painful as they may. Take, for example, the practice of traffick in intoxicating drinks. Knowing the tendency of these drinks to injure and to destroy mankind, the practice of dealing in them as articles of merchandize, or of customarily using them ourselves, cannot be vindicated on the ground, that from this practice there may result to us some present and personal advantage. If the thing is in itself wrong as a practice and injurious to mankind, then there are no redeeming considerations in our own personal advantage to make it right. It is to be avoided accordingly, as we would avoid the frown and curse of God, whatever pleasure, or gain, or influence, or credit, we might secure to ourselves by its continuance. It is *wrong*, and this is sufficient to set the seal of heaven's interdict upon it. It is *wrong*, and this is sufficient to make the loss of the soul justly and properly the price of our gratification if we yield to it.

3. Another first-principle to which our Lord always adhered in his inculcation of moral truth upon the people, is, *that God is to be, in every circumstance, the supreme object of regard to his creatures.* At his throne all creatures are to bow. His place in the soul is to be the first and highest. His pleasure, however signified to men, provided only that it is clearly made known, puts an end to all strife; it is to be implicitly followed. We may love other objects that are truly lovely, and which are thus worthy of our affection; but God is to be the *supreme* object. In the homage which we yield to him there must be no superior, no rival. This homage too, must be of a sincere, substantial, practical character, evinced in actions and evinced habitually. From this principle our Savior never departed. He invariably carried it along with him in all his instructions to his disciples and others. No matter in what circumstances men might be placed; circumstances however varied could not affect the supremacy of God, or make it right to withhold from him the creature's supreme regard. There was no expediency, in any supposable combination of circumstances, which could supersede the obligation to love and serve him first and chief of all. This duty was paramount in every possible ex-

igency of human affairs. Upon this great principle the teaching of our Savior always proceeded; he ever assumed it as unquestionable and never relinquished it. Now here again we discover his consummate wisdom and perfect knowledge of the case. Man needs to be dealt with in this manner. He needs to have the authority and the claims of God laid full and strong upon him; and to be summoned at once, in view of this high authority and these indisputable claims, to surrender his heart to him implicitly, and without reserve or delay. For the very moment, that the being of the true and living God is admitted, his authority is established, and his claims are placed beyond all question. This, of course, is the moment when the sinner ought to give up all his apologies for sin, and yield himself to his Maker's pleasure; and the surest way to lead him to do so, is to take the obligation for granted, and to press it upon him, as a point admitting of no question, and with all possible energy.

4. Another principle kept in view by our Lord in his instructions, is, *that the law of God expresses accurately and fully what he would have mankind do, and what he would have them abstain from doing, as the subjects of his moral government.* God's law is the exact standard and measure of man's duty. It teaches us with perfect precision, what God desires of men in the way of love and obedience to him. God in his law does not say one thing and mean another. He does not call upon men to love him with all the heart, when he knows, that this would not be best, or that he does not desire it. He does desire it. He knows that it would be best. He knows that holiness is better than sin; that doing right is better than doing wrong; and his preference of the former to the latter accords with his knowledge on the subject. This preference of holiness to sin, of doing right to doing wrong, he has expressed in his law. That law is a transcript of his real feelings; it shows what, in all cases, he would, that the conduct of men should be. Else, why does he require this conduct of them? require it of them all in every possible circumstance? and require it too under such solemn and awful sanctions? Else, how are we to know what conduct, upon the whole, he really desires of us, or would be pleased with? How are we to know what conduct would be right, and best, and most in accordance with the general good of his kingdom? If we cannot depend upon his law to guide us in this matter, upon what can we depend? Plainly upon nothing. We are all afloat. There is nothing certain as to what we ought (upon the whole) to do, or as to what God (upon the whole) would have us do, or as to what (upon the whole) it is preferable that we should do. Now our Savior, in his construction of the divine law, never adopted a principle which would lead to such uncertainty as this. He proceeded upon a different

ground,—that the Most High has but one will and one feeling in respect to what he *would* have men do, and that this will and feeling are expressed in his law, and truly expressed, just as they are. Hence the Savior took so much pains (in his sermon on the mount,) to vindicate the law from every perversion, and to clear it from the corrupt glosses of those who would make it speak another meaning from its true and real one. Never would it have been thought, from our Savior's exposition of the law, that God, as some appear to imagine, has two wills respecting the conduct of men, one that they should do right, and another that they should do wrong; one declared, the other secret; one representing sin as an evil and bitter thing which his soul hateth, and the other regarding it as the best means which he could employ for the happiness of his kingdom. His will and feelings in view of sin, whether considered in itself, or as a means of happiness to his creatures, our Savior has represented as being only and invariably opposed to it; opposed to it under all circumstances, and under every aspect in which it can be contemplated. The obvious reason of this is, that sin is wholly and in every view of it an evil. That God has sometimes made use of it as an *occasion* of good, does not prove, that it is good in itself, or good in its tendencies, or preferable to what holiness would have been in its place, or in any way desirable. All this fact proves, is, that *for some reason or other*, God saw best not to prevent it,—that reason being left unrevealed to us, and possibly undiscoverable by us, at least in the present world. The reason for God's permission of sin, whatever it is, the Savior has no where declared or brought into view. Nor was this necessary. It would have done us no good if he had. But he has abundantly sustained and defended the law of God, as correctly and fully expressing the divine will, showing what sort of conduct in men God is pleased with, and to what sort of conduct he is opposed; enjoining the former and prohibiting the latter; and thus making man himself responsible for the course which he may choose to pursue.

5. Another principle to which our Lord adheres in his instructions to the people, is, *that we are always to consider the good of others as of equal value with our own*. Viewed as a theoretical principle, this would seem to be sufficiently plain. The mere fact, that any good is our *own* and not another's, has certainly no tendency to enhance its intrinsic value. And yet, as a practical matter, this fact is every day called in question. Men do not estimate the happiness of others as they do their own; the same thing which is an inferior good, viewed as belonging to another, when seen as our own, at once becomes magnified in value, and is regarded as the superior good. This is only stating, in another form, the universally admitted fact of human selfish-

ness. As men do not make God supreme, and thus give to him his right place in the universe, so they do not, practically, regard each other as equals, and thus give to their fellow-men their right place in the system. They arrogate too much to themselves. They do not think sufficiently of their neighbor's good. "Am I my brother's keeper?" was the spirit which marked the first fratricide among men; and somewhat of the same spirit reigns still among our race, and marks no small part of their conduct one towards another. They do not value, sufficiently, each others happiness, and strive to promote it. Now our Savior, in his instructions to the people, sought to rectify this false view of things. He placed all mankind on this broad level, and made the happiness of each and of all to be substantially an object of equal value. Upon this principle, (of a substantial equality among men,) he based all moral precepts which were designed to regulate their conduct one towards another. The little distinctions of high and low, rich and poor, bond and free, wielding power and struggling against power unrighteously exercised, were not allowed to constitute any sufficient ground for mutual coldness, distrust, and alienation among men. However high or however low men might be in the scale of this world's society, still they were men, and nothing but men; equals in the eye of God; possessing a common origin, a common nature, a common destiny; brothers in guilt and in condemnation, needing each others sympathies, and fitted to receive them; hastening through a momentary and troubled existence here, to an undisputed and speedy equality in the grave. To men as thus allied to each other, the Savior preached divine truth. And what was that truth? It was, that men should love one another, befriend one another, pray for one another, strive to promote each others happiness; and this too on the ground, that they were all equals before God, that "one was their Master, and they were brethren." Happy would it be for our world, if the same principle was now always adhered to, in the inculcation of the relative and social duties of life.

6. Another great principle ever assumed and proceeded upon by the Savior in his preaching, is, *that men are responsible to God for their moral actions*. No matter how these actions originate in the mind of man; no matter at what precise period in his early existence these actions commence; no matter what is the character of these actions, or how invariably certain they are wrong, till the Spirit of Grace interposes to make them right; whatever may be the originating cause of moral action in mankind, or whenever it commences, our Savior always taught, that along with moral action, and in the very nature of moral action, is to be found the fact of moral responsibility to God; that men are under obligation to him, (not merely as they are to themselves

and to their fellow-men, but in a far higher sense,) to do right; to follow that which is good, and to abstain from the most hidden purposes of wrong doing. He constantly reminds them, that they have to answer not only to an accusing conscience within themselves, or to an outraged public sentiment in the community; but that wrong doing in any respect or degree binds the doer of it over to the tribunal of *God*, to answer for the wrong done directly before him. How often does he forewarn the wicked of a judgment to come; how often does he set before them the fact, that *God* will bring every secret thing into judgment, whether it is good or bad; how often does he conduct his hearers (as it were) to the *Eternal Throne*, and make the eye of omniscience to bend in most searching and withering blaze upon them, whenever they would do wrong. His sermon on the mount is an admirable specimen of holding men to the point of their responsibility to *God* for all their moral conduct; and this fact gives tenfold energy to the practical instructions which this discourse contains. We feel as we read it, how solemn a thing it is to live and act in this world; since every thing we do has such an intimate relation to *God* as our Judge, and presupposes so strongly our certainty of future reward or punishment; that the realities of the coming world seem to intermingle with the ordinary affairs of this life, and to spread their influence over them. Here, again, we cannot but admire the wisdom of the *Great Teacher*. In our endeavors to impress the minds of men with serious things, and make them feel convicted and distressed on account of their sins; how useless is it to exhibit merely the abstract obligation to do right, arising out of the nature and fitness of things, and the abstract rewards and punishments of an approving or condemning conscience; or to set forth the abstract beauty of virtue and the deformity of vice, and thus try to reason mankind into conviction and alarm for their sins. How much more likely are we to do good by bringing directly into view man's responsibility to *God*, and by making them feel, that it is with him they have to do, throughout the entire period of their moral agency, and in every moral action.—The foregoing specifications will show how our Savior, in his teaching of the people, was wont to proceed upon a few great fundamental *principles*, and to keep these constantly in view; leaving matters of less importance, or about which the minds of men were not settled, to be discussed by those whose taste and inclinations were different from his own.

Our Savior's *manner* of inculcating these and other principles of morals and religion, further indicates the same exquisite skill and heavenly wisdom, and deserves also a separate and individual consideration. To specify a few particulars:

1. *Extreme simplicity of statement.* This was an important characteristic of Christ's manner of teaching. Whatever was the point which he wished to present, that point singly and alone, unmixed with other things, and unobscured by that confusion of objects which such a mixture always produces, was made to stand out prominently before the eye of the mind. When, for example, he would expound the first table of the law, and bring out to view, comprehensively and clearly, man's duty to his Maker, what a beautiful and lucid simplicity is there in his statement; the whole law is simplified and concentrated into the exercise of *love*; so perfectly clear, that no one can misapprehend it; so perfectly true and just, that no one can question the thing stated: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; this is the first and great commandment in the law." Is the second and perhaps more difficult table of the law to be expounded? How beautifully and how easily is it done: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." One word again explains the whole; it is all summed up in *love*. Is it asked further, what this love is, and by what practical rule we may try ourselves in regard to it? The answer is at hand again, marked by the same divine simplicity: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them;"—thus putting it to ourselves, and to our own sense of propriety, to say what we ought to do to others, by just imagining what we should wish them to do to us were we in their circumstances and they in ours. The supposition of a simple change of circumstances, between us and our neighbor, often simplifies wonderfully the question of our duty to him, and resolves at once many a puzzling case of conscience. For instance, a man wishes to know whether it is his duty to give of his property to spread the gospel among the heathen; and if so, how much he is to give. Let him simply change circumstances with the heathen, and it will greatly assist him to determine the knotty point in question; because it will give a chance for right reasoning and an unbiassed sense of justice to operate in his own breast towards his poor suffering neighbors. So when our Lord would condemn the principle of vindictive retaliation among men, and teach the true doctrine on this subject, the same delightful simplicity characterizes the whole statement. Instead of returning hatred for hatred, and injury for injury, his language is: "I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." When he was inquired of, how far meekness and forbearance were to be extended under repeated provocations and wrongs, his answer was: "I say not until seven times, but until seventy times seven," that is, a retaliatory and vindictive spirit under injuries, however accu-

mulated they may be, is never right, is always wrong. And then the illustration which follows: "That ye may be the children of the Highest; for he causes his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. Be ye therefore merciful as your Father in heaven is merciful." We do not stop to point out the moral excellence of the spirit here inculcated. It is the beautiful simplicity and clearness of the instruction given to which we have called the attention. Who can fail to see what our Lord meant in these instructions, as well as that the sentiments inculcated are right and replete with moral excellence. All our Lord's instructions were of the same simple and easily intelligible character. They remind us of heaven,—not less as a world of *light* than of love.

2. Our Savior, in his teaching, was wont to employ a great variety of *illustrations*; sometimes by means of short and pointed similies; sometimes more expanded parables; and sometimes by incidental allusions to present objects and passing occurrences in the natural world. Scarcely ever does he teach any important truth without making use of some well-chosen illustration, to render it more clear or more impressive. He knew the mental habits of the people to whom his preaching was addressed. He knew, that in general they were not a cultivated and an intellectual people. Their conceptions were gross, and they needed a species of instruction which should make much use of their senses in so setting truth before their minds as to do them good, and he adapted his instructions to them accordingly. When he would rebuke the pride of man, and inculcate on his disciples the need of cultivating a lowly and confiding temper of heart, he does not merely deliver to them the abstract and general, though all important truth, that man must be converted and experience a radical transformation of character in order to their being saved; but, to impress this sentiment more strongly, he takes a little child and sets him in the midst of them, and then tells them how salvation is to be obtained: "Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of God. Whoso receiveth not the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." When he would teach men to confide in the all-governing providence of God, and not yield to impatience, or discouragement, or unbelieving fear, he summons to his aid the objects of nature around him, and makes the dependence of all her tribes, animate and inanimate, subservient to his design. "Consider the lilies of the field." "Consider the ravens." Who nourishes them? Who gives them their delicate clothing? Who protects them in the storm? Who preserves them through the changing seasons? The field, untrodden by the foot of man and uncultivated by human care, has flowers surpassing in glory the

richest and wisest of earthly kings, but "they toil not, neither do they spin." Who rears and upholds these little and delicate structures? "If God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not clothe you, O ye of little faith?" When our Savior would impress upon us the duty of kindness to our poor neighbor, and tell us who is our neighbor, he relates the misfortune of a Jew, who "went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among thieves." Waylaid and plundered by a band of robbers, he is left upon the highway, weltering in his blood, and half dead. A priest and a Levite pass by that way, but offer no aid to the sufferer. It is a Samaritan, that passing by takes pity on him and saves his life. What a beautiful illustration is this, to show us who is our neighbor, and what is the proper conduct which is due from us one towards another in any circumstance of need! When he would make known to us the real feelings of our Creator, and of all holy beings, in view of the recovery of lost sinners, he gives us the story of the prodigal son; and thus refers us to the strongest sensibilities of nature within us, as an illustration of the paternal interest which God himself takes, in beholding one of his lost creatures recovered to virtue and to happiness. This delightful interest, which the Creator himself feels in receiving back to his favor the lost sinner, is represented too as a diffusive common interest, felt throughout the heavenly world. What a vivid impression does this give us of the importance of a single conversion! In what other way could we have been made to feel this fact so strongly, or been prompted to use our powers so earnestly, in spreading abroad through the earth the means of salvation to our fellow-men! When he would teach us what it is to be finally lost from God's holy kingdom, or finally happy in his favor, what appalling and what delightful imagery does he employ! The poor suffering Lazarus, coldly and disdainfully repelled from the sympathies of his fellow-men, and left to die of hunger at the gate of human affluence, because no man would give unto him, is carried by angels to Abraham's bosom. Despised on earth, he is admitted, beyond the grave, to the intimate fellowship of the "father of the faithful." Friendless on earth, when he dies, he is admitted to the bosom-confidence and communion of the "friend of God." Angels perform the office of conducting him to his blissful home. How exceedingly does the imagery here employed heighten the impression of the simple truth thereby illustrated, that good men, however neglected and overlooked on earth, will be honored and happy in the world to come! So, too, on the other hand, what a fearful picture of wretchedness is that which is drawn by our Lord, in the same chapter, as descriptive of the state of a wicked man after death. The contrast is of the most finished and stri-

king kind. It is impossible to conceive of any thing more so. He was caressed and honored in this world; his friends and flatterers have now all forsaken him. He was rich and fared sumptuously every day on earth; he now begs for a drop of water to cool his tongue. Despair of relief, nay of the very smallest mitigation of his wretchedness, is held up as one prominent feature in his condition. How greatly enhanced is every state of suffering, when that state is known to be completely hopeless of any change for the better! Such is the future condition of wicked men, as described by our Savior. So, when he taught the fact, that men are answerable to God for their conduct, and that this life is a state of probation, with reference to an approaching state of rewards and punishments which is to take place after death,—with what terrific solemnity does he invest this fact by means of the imagery, so replete with the sublime and awful, which he employs! There is something not a little impressive and solemn in the trial of a single individual for his life before a mere earthly tribunal. The majesty of the law, the criminality of transgression, the sacredness attached to the duty of providing that the law be sustained, and the peace and welfare of the community be protected, are there brought home to the mind with a power seldom or never felt under any other circumstances. The fact of an actual trial produces such an impression. So our Savior, to produce a similar one on our minds, respecting the law of God, and the sinner's criminality for breaking it as he does, has arrayed before us, by anticipation, the great actual trial of mankind at the last day. What an impressive transaction is it! How many a sinner has been led to tremble in looking forward to it, and to flee for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before him in the gospel! In this amazing trial, the universe assembles, and angels are the attending ministers and marshals on the occasion. All the human race is to be tried, and God himself is Judge. The rewards are life eternal and death eternal. When, therefore, an inspired account of that day is given, no wonder, that, as the writer beholds the great white throne and him who sits upon it, the heavens and the earth should seem to him to flee away, and there should be found no place for them! No wonder, that the Judge and the judgment should fill the entire field of vision, and all besides should disappear from the scene, as being lost in the surpassing splendors of those glorious objects! Thus was the Savior, in all his exhibitions of important truth, wont to resort freely to comparisons and illustrations of various sorts, in order to give additional point and force to the sentiments which he inculcated.

3. *Directness* was another characteristic of our Lord's manner of teaching. He did not, as men often do, go round and round the point, and lose himself and his hearers in a cloud of splen-

did abstractions and generalizations. He did not refine and attenuate truth into mere gossamer threads and gauze-work, till the strength and substance of his moral lessons was all refined away and lost. He had solemn and weighty verities to teach, and he taught them as solemn and weighty verities. For example, when he enforced the great duties which man owes to God, he did not, as he might have done, paint out in beautiful picture the exquisite loveliness of religion, and in this way seek to allure men into the practice of its claims. He told them, that they *must* love God; that they *must* repent of their sins; that they *must* believe the gospel; that they *must* give up the world, the pursuit of happiness from the world, and set their affections on things above: that the only possible alternative, on this subject, was compliance or perdition. When, also, he taught men their duty to one another, he did it plainly and with great directness. He did not inculcate truth and duty upon mankind, arising out of the various relations subsisting among them, by urging merely or mainly the fitness or moral excellence of the thing. He did not descant on the loveliness of virtue and the deformity of sin, as he might consistently have done. When a master in Israel came to him by night to consult him, as a teacher sent from God, respecting his doctrine, he did not begin afar off, approaching cautiously and circuitously towards the point of instruction to which he at length intended to reach, if his pupil would bear it; he came at once to the point, and preached to him the doctrine of a radical transformation of character, as essential to his or any other man's salvation. He might have told this man what a beautiful thing religion was; how easily it might be obtained; and how much good it would do him if he should be so happy as to embrace it. He might have gone into some long and nicely adjusted argument, to show, that this world could not make men happy; that the immortal mind is not to be satisfied with earthly good; that, hence, it was needful for men to seek an interest in the kingdom of God, as the only thing which could make them happy; and thus have sought to prepare the way for something, by and by, more direct and personal. But he adopted a different course. He announced directly a fundamental law of his kingdom, and told this ruler of the Jews, that "except a man be born again, of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of heaven." The same directness in his method of instruction is every where visible. He comes to the point at once, and with all men, let them be who they may,—pharisees or sadducees, friends or foes, ignorant or learned, priests, rulers, or common people. They all have the truth from his lips plainly stated, and unless their own perverseness prevent, they all understand it, and see its intended application to themselves.

4. He addresses the *common-sense* of men. There is a way of stating truth to mankind, which seems to have nothing to do with their common-sense. It is beautiful, perhaps, as addressed to their taste ; profound, perhaps, as addressed to their metaphysical acumen ; interesting, it may be, as calling into exercise their classical attainments ; and it may not be wanting in logical consecutiveness of premises and conclusions, and so may be a good specimen of reasoning. Still, after all this, it may be such an exhibition of truth as is calculated to do but little good, because it overlooks the plain common-sense of mankind, and only addresses them under some other and different view of their capacities and wants. Suppose, that we enter upon an argument to prove it right to love and obey the infinitely perfect God. We begin by exhibiting his perfections in detail, proceed to his works of creation, providence, and redemption, as illustrating more fully his character, and close by setting forth the creature's capacities to love God, and his indebtedness to him. And then we come to the only possible conclusion in the case, to wit, that man is bound to love such a being as God is. Here is a rigid demonstration ; but in general of what use is it ? The common-sense of mankind has wholly anticipated us in this argument, and admitted the conclusion before we begin to reason about it. All men know and spontaneously feel it to be right and proper, that God should be loved. They may deny his existence, or misapprehend some points in his character, but, his existence and true character being admitted, the obligation to love him follows of course ; and is at once acquiesced in by the natural unsophisticated feelings of all mankind. It is a common-sense principle, also, that there are reciprocal rights and duties subsisting among men, *one towards another*. It would be altogether superfluous to undertake to prove, that the child is bound to honor and obey the parent, and the parent to protect and guide the child. So, also, were we to undertake to prove, that God required of man a set of duties which man was physically unable to perform,—that is, a set of duties which he *would* perform if he could, but which with the best disposition towards it, he *cannot* perform ; the common-sense of mankind repels the idea of any such obligation, and denies that the things in question are duties. Should we attempt to prove such an identity to exist between Adam and his race, as that what *he* did *they* did, *his* guilt is *their* guilt, and that *they* justly merit death, (not merely *in consequence* of his actions,) but *for* what *he* has done,—the common-sense of mankind repels the conclusion as false and monstrous. Suppose we undertake to prove man to be in such a sense dependent on God for his moral exercises, as that (while he is upheld in being,) he cannot put forth *any* exercises without the help of God enabling him to do so ; and suppose this to be

admitted,—will not the common-sense of mankind deny, that he is responsible for his actions? How is he to *blame* for them, if he had no hand in originating them; and how, on this supposition, are they truly and properly *his* actions? Now our Savior in his teaching always addresses himself to the common-sense of mankind; or rather, he never contradicts this principle of our nature. The truths which he delivers are never contrary to the enlightened reason and plain unperverted judgment of the human mind. Were they so, how could we possibly believe them, except as the result of mental hallucination or a most strange perverseness?

5. The Savior, in his mode of teaching, had much to do with men's *consciences*. Truth is always armed with tenfold power over the mind, when it is so stated as to be readily and at once seconded by the moral feelings of those to whom it is presented. Nor is it ever urged to any good effect, except as it does meet with a ready response in the moral feelings of those to whom it is addressed. Hence the great importance in all our teaching on moral subjects, of securing the concurring testimony of an enlightened conscience in those who hear us. With this testimony in our favor, we have a powerful hold on the heart, and resistance to the truth becomes far more difficult. Without such a testimony in our favor, we may amuse and entertain our audiences, but we shall never lead them to feel distressed on account of their sins, and bring them to the Savior for refuge from impending wrath. Wicked men, indeed, are exceedingly unwilling to have their consciences plainly and faithfully addressed. There is no kind of preaching that so annoys them as this; there is none under which they are so impatient, and so full of devices for shielding themselves against it. Men will hear a preacher on almost any subject, if he will let their consciences alone. They will not hear him long, nor with much patience, if they find him arming their consciences against them, and thus breaking up their guilty repose in sin. They will "hate" him so long as they find him "prophesying evil" against them, and in doing so, carrying the decided testimony of their consciences along with him. Hence, knowing this to be so, there is danger lest those who present the truth will become weary of doing that which only gives pain, and will preach so as not to disturb the conscience. There is reason to fear lest, unconsciously perhaps, they so far consult their own peace and quiet, as to address other susceptibilities in the minds of their hearers, and let the conscience slumber. But this will be certain death to the souls of men. They need to have their consciences alarmed and filled with anguish, while they continue to tread the flowery paths of sin. They need to have the mirror of truth held up full before their mental eye,

that they may see what their condition is, and escape from it while the door of mercy stands open. The Great Teacher knew this, and always conformed his teaching to it. When the Jews, with an entire forgetfulness on their own part of their great criminality in the sight of God, and with much apparent self-complacency, brought to the Savior a confessedly guilty woman, taken in the act of breaking one of the divine commands, and wished to know whether the punishment prescribed in the law of Moses should be inflicted on her. "Master, shall we stone her?" "Yes," was the reply, "and let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone." This turned their eye in upon themselves, aroused their consciences, and made them see, that they had something else to do besides condemning and putting to death the poor trembling culprit before them. Thus *she* was brought to repentance, and *they* were, at least, convicted of their sins. When the appointed time for the Savior's suffering had come, and he was spending a few of the last hours of his life in fraternal communion with his disciples, and the covert traitor's hand was then upon the table with him; when he told them, that one of them (without specifying which,) should betray him, and they all began to inquire, "Lord, is it I?" and Judas himself demanded, "Is it I?" what an assault was it upon the guilty dissembler's conscience, as the Savior distinctly pointed him out to the company! He now stood exposed to himself a traitor confessed. He saw and felt the burning hell of rage and malice against his Lord kindling up within him, and the spirit of all evil took full possession of him and hurried him to his doom.

6. The Savior taught men with that calm and dignified *confidence* of manner, which is always inspired by clear perceptions of the truth and importance of what is uttered. The things on which he insisted, were so clear to his own mind, that his manner of communicating them must have been (as it was,) entirely unembarrassed, and free from all appearance of doubt or misgiving. He testified only what he had seen and heard. He *knew* the truth of what he uttered; and this gave to his teaching a striking peculiarity of manner. It would have savored of dogmatism in any other teacher; but in him it is a manner perfectly natural and worn with unaffected ease. He saw so clearly the evil nature of sin, and the curse of God which hangs over it, with the strength of its dominion in the soul of the sinner, that the asseveration, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of heaven," appears perfectly in place as coming from his lips, and just what we should suppose him to utter under such a view of things as that which he possessed. So plainly needful, and so vastly important, to his apprehension, was the change in question, that to have used a tone less positive and

confident, would have been altogether unnatural and improper. What he declared in words was only what he saw to be vital, essential truth ; and how should he proclaim it but in the language of unhesitating confidence ? "Ye have heard, that it hath been said by them of old time, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth ; but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil ; I say unto you, love your enemies ; I say unto you, swear not at all." In this style of assured confidence was the Savior wont to announce the precepts of heaven to mankind. This it was, which in a great extent, imparted to his instructions their well-known power to excite the wakeful and wandering attention of the people. "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." Now there is a confidence of manner, in the statement and defense of divine truth, which is due to the truth itself, and the want of which goes far to involve us in the suspicion of treachery to her sacred cause. On the fundamental doctrines of religion, at least, there may be, and ought to be, a clearness in our perceptions of truth, which shall give earnestness and decision to our manner of exhibiting them ; and which shall preclude any thing like weakness of statement or timidity of application. On other subjects of acknowledged importance to mankind, clear views of what is true and right are always understood to entitle a man to speak out boldly and unequivocally ; and why not on the most important of all subjects ?

7. Our Savior enforced the truths which he taught by the high sanctions of *eternity*. True, he instructed men, that virtue is not without a reward in this world ; and that vice carries along with it here on earth the inseparable alloy of discontent for the present, and foreboding for the future. He taught, that simple-hearted devotedness to the interests of his kingdom would receive in return an amount of good during this life "a hundred fold" greater than could be obtained in any other way. Still, the great, commanding motives to action which he constantly set before men, were the solemnities of the judgment and the scenes of *eternity*. To the approbation or disapprobation of God, as shortly to be expressed in the rewards and punishments of the coming world, he was wont habitually to refer, and to press men by these high considerations, to repent of their sins, and to pursue steadily the path of obedience. How often do we hear him adopting such language as the following in his instructions to the people : "Fear not them that kill the body, and after that have no more which they can do ; but I will forewarn you whom you shall fear : fear him, who after he hath killed, is able to cast both soul and body into hell, yea I say unto you, fear him." "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of man and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the

resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." These are the true motives to put us upon thinking and acting, as we shall ere long wish we had done. Such considerations will often have weight when every other inducement has lost its power. There is something in the favor or frown of God, which is not to be trifled with. There is something in the great realities of eternity, to which the sinful heart of man echoes back a responsive shudder of interest and alarm. There is something in the cold solemnity and stillness of the grave,—considered as the vestibule of a temple not made with mortal hands, and whose inner recesses no mortal eye hath explored,—that is fitted to make us pause and collect all our thoughts about us, as we pass away into its long dim aisles, and approach the majesty of the Divine Presence there, as if in his own appropriate dwelling place. Some may affect to despise the solemnities of eternity; they deceive themselves; every instinctive and unperverted feeling of their nature does homage to these invisible solemnities. The heart of man which may stand erect, and refuse to bow before all other objects, pertaining only to this world, here involuntarily bows itself down, and owns an influence at which it cannot, dare not mock.

8. The Redeemer taught men *fearlessly*. Much truth is concealed from mankind through fear of giving offense. That is, it is not held out to them in its native simplicity and true symmetry and proportions. A sort of sympathy with the feelings of the audience, and a secret apprehension of giving pain, blunt the speaker's own perception of those truths on which he ought especially to insist; so that he does not *see* them distinctly, and with all the vividness and strength of perception with which he otherwise might see them. He does not therefore present them to others in the coloring of life and reality, as he should. Hence they do no good; they only serve to harden. He is not at all aware, perhaps, of the real difficulty. He wonders why the truth does not take hold and harrow up, into distress and anguish, the torpid tameness of the sinner's soul. But he need not greatly wonder; for the fact is, the things presented to the sinner's mind are so vague, shadowy, and distant, that they cannot take any hold. It is not possible to make cool abstractions and the mere sound of words reach the heart. Now one cause of all this fog and mist in our exhibitions of truth, is, that we are afraid to declare the truth simply and fully; afraid of its reaction upon ourselves. To deal plainly with other men's consciences, presupposes, that our own are not greatly vulnerable to the shafts of truth. A fear of giving offense to those on whom we may be depending for our support; an apprehension of this sort of danger, may lead us to withhold the right arrow from the bow, or to take an indefi-

nite aim, or to draw the string too feebly to inflict a mortal wound. We are afraid, that execution will be done, and that thereby work will be made for ourselves, in healing the distress inflicted, and leading the anxious sinner to the soothing consolations of the gospel, a task sometimes laborious and difficult. Now from none of these, or any other causes, was the Savior ever afraid to speak out and tell men the truth. His denunciation of the hypocritical scribes and pharisees, those "whited sepulchers" of the nation in its last stages of degeneracy and moral putrescence, is in point to show, that he was above the influence of fear in warning wicked men of their guilt and their danger; whatever rank in society they held, or whatever reputation for uncommon purity of morals they possessed.

9. He taught in a way adapted to *soothe* and *encourage* the distressed, timid, and trembling heart. It often requires no small discernment, and no small firmness of religious principle, to perceive just where the sinner (professedly applying for instruction,) is to be met with the sternness of rebuke for his iniquities; and just where this sternness in rebuking him for his sins, should give place to a manner more soothing and better adapted to administer encouragement to his mind. To err on either hand, may, in many circumstances, be fatal to the soul. To give encouragement before the sinner is prepared to receive it, or to do any thing which is calculated to exert a soothing, quieting influence upon his mind, while he is yet unhumbled, and disposed to justify himself before God, is only to co-operate with him in effecting his ruin. So, also, to withhold encouragement when his mind is properly prepared to receive it; to exhibit an appearance of sternness and severity, when his heart is broken and trembling in view of his past life, may be equally injurious to him. To know exactly when and how to administer encouragement to a sinner's mind, seems to us, therefore, a point of no small difficulty. And when the case is a clear one, and there is no doubt in respect to the course to be pursued, it is not always easy to say and do those things which shall make just the impression they were intended to make. Is the troubled, trembling heart to be soothed to rest by having the hopes of the gospel set before him? It is not always easy so to bring the hopes of the gospel into view, as to soothe the anxious spirit to peace, without at the same time blunting the sense of guilt, and seeming to take part with him against the law which condemns him. Now our Savior knew how to administer encouragement to the trembling heart, without blunting its sensibility to its own guilt; without making the impression that sin is a small evil, or that condemnation to eternal punishment for sin, is an unrighteous or a questionable thing. He could soothe the trembling sinner's mind, and yet lay him low in the

dust before God ; encourage him to hope in the divine mercy, and yet abate nothing from the strictness or the terribleness of the law's demands against him : so that while he felt comforted, he was also humbled and subdued, and a sweet, resigned, child-like temper of mind was the result all the rest of his days. Never did any individual apply to the Savior, under a just perception of his own spiritual necessities, and with a timid, trembling heart, who was not sent away encouraged and comforted. Many came to him for relief ; and none who came, in the manner just spoken of, were denied the relief sought. Yet it was granted in such a way, that nothing but humility and contrition of spirit on account of sin, could possibly be the legitimate consequence of the favor shown. He soothed the wounded spirit ; but it was in such a way as made the sinner ever afterwards to feel, that a meek and lowly frame of heart became him. He took off the burden from the troubled sinner's mind, when he sincerely came to him for relief, but it was only to sink him still lower in the dust, under a consciousness of his ill desert ; and in the very act of administering relief to make him feel the weight of a debt of gratitude to his benefactor, such as no subsequent fidelity on his part in his Redeemer's service could ever adequately repay ; and thus in fact to bind him voluntarily and forever to his Redeemer's service. Happy, blessed result of administering relief to the troubled mind, wherever or by whomsoever this result can be secured ! The foregoing remarks may have prepared the way for some practical and we hope profitable deductions from our subject, a few of which we shall particularly notice.

1. The importance of *studying* the history of our Savior as a teacher of divine truth. The purity of his *life*, and the excellence of his *doctrines*, have been often insisted on ; and too much cannot be said on these points. But is there not something in the spirit and *manner* of his teaching which also demands attention,—more attention than has usually been bestowed upon it ? Does it not afford, in many respects, a most instructive example for imitation to religious teachers at the present day ? A close examination of our Savior's mode of teaching, would show us, that it was adapted to produce the following effects, and that it did extensively produce them :—It was adapted to break up the torpor of men's minds on the subject of their salvation, and set them on *thinking*, and such was the effect. It was adapted to make men *unhappy* while they were determined not to give up their sins, and it did greatly disturb the consciences of many. It was adapted to awaken *hostility* on the part of those who hated the truth and who meant not to embrace it ; and it did powerfully stir up the latent enmity of their hearts. It was fitted to clear away the rubbish of *false* opinions and *false* theories in religion, which had been ac-

cumulating round the truth for many ages; to vindicate the *character* and *government* of God, and make men feel with whom it is, that they have to do in all their hard and unworthy thoughts of him. It was adapted to strip men of all their *excuses* and self-justifying pleas for their sins; to abase the pride of man; to take away all hope, and shut him up in complete despair, till his heart should be brought down and his spirit humbled within him; and then to breathe peace and joy into the contrite sinner's soul. Now a system of instruction, which both as to matter and manner was fitted to produce these results, and did extensively produce them, ought to be carefully studied by mankind, and especially by the publicly accredited teachers of religion. On them the obligation is peculiarly imperative, that they not only read the history of our Savior, but carefully *study* it, with the design of seeing how he presented truth to men's minds, and of getting their own hearts imbued with similar feelings. Were we to specify particular instances, in illustration of our meaning, we would refer to what the Savior said in regard to "little children" being encouraged to come to him; to his conversation with the woman of Samaria; and more especially, to his last discourse and prayer with his disciples before he suffered. What beautiful simplicity; what skill and faithfulness; and, above all, what calm dignity, mingled with peculiar condescension and affectionateness, do we here witness in our Lord's teaching! Would not the careful *study* of such an example be a useful exercise to all his ministers? How could they better qualify themselves, for many at least of the duties and trials of their office, than to drink freely at this pure fountain, and to consult frequently and carefully the illustrious example of the Great Teacher?

2. We may briefly notice several points, in relation to which they who teach God's truth to their fellow-men are apt to *fail*. And first, in being too *general*. The mind of man is so constituted as to be unable to take in but a few things at a time. Its views are never very distinct, and therefore never very vivid, except when they are fixed upon a few simple objects. Complexity and multiplicity, in the objects contemplated, are always attended with a corresponding obscurity and indefiniteness in the perceptions of the mind to which they give rise. Our Savior's manner of teaching was remarkably characterized by simplicity; he descended to particulars, and pointed out the *identical thing* which he wished to present to his hearers, detached and separated from all other things. They who would present truth clearly and forcibly to men's minds, must copy this example. They must avoid being too general; they must descend to particulars. They must have a distinct object in view, and they must aim to present it distinctly to the view of their hearers.

Again, many religious teachers are apt to fail by being too *abstract*. Truth is only the plain simple reality of things. But in the hands of many, it loses all its ordinary, plain, matter-of-fact qualities, and is refined away into the mere subtle essences of things. Truth, merely in the abstract, can do no one any good. The truth which does good to men's souls is that which comes home to men's business and bosoms. It is such truth as this,—that all men are sinners against God, and must speedily repent of their sins and turn to God, or finally and forever perish; that now is the accepted time and the day of salvation; but that soon the door of mercy will be closed, and it will be too late.

Thirdly. Others fail by taking too many things for *granted*. They preach as if their audiences knew all that *they* know in relation to religious truth and duty. They do not consider, that many of those who hear them have not had *their* opportunities for gaining religious knowledge; they are young; they are immersed in the business or pleasures of this world; they have no relish for divine truth, and therefore, though they may have *heard* much, they have never seriously *thought* of any thing beyond the customary round of their every-day concerns in this world. In regard to such persons, (and these compose the great mass of human society,) their *perception* of divine truth is extremely limited; and in much of the preaching which they hear, if they believe them at all, they are obliged to take many things for granted. But such truth will do them little good. They should be made to *see* it for themselves; to see *how* it is so; and therefore to see, that there can be no *doubt* about it. In order to this, much explanation is often necessary, and things are to be dwelt upon, which may seem to be too obvious and easily understood to need it. Much illustration, also, is demanded, in order to get the truth more vividly before the mind; and, after all, the perceptions of the speaker will be, in most cases, but imperfectly transferred to the minds of his hearers. Many also fail from being too *discursive* in their mode of teaching; they are not sufficiently pointed; they introduce irrelevant or unimportant matter, and weary attention by presenting truths which have little or no application to their hearers. Many others fail from an unwillingness to present *offensive* truth; they are timid and time-serving; they do not love to pierce, and wound, and break the heart, as they must if they would do any good; they love their own ease better than the souls of their hearers. So did not the Savior.

3. A word or two as to what is the most *effective* manner of inculcating divine truth. The speaker himself must see clearly the points which he wishes to present to others. He must *feel* the power of truth in his own soul. He must select such topics as are of a useful, practical tendency. He must address the com-

mon-sense of mankind, and take care to be understood, not barely to be intelligible. He must cultivate a high degree of personal holiness. He must secure, in favor of his instructions, the enlightened and approving testimony of men's consciences, and make much use of the great unchangeable *principles* of morality. He must exhibit truth with its proper sanctions,—make no compromise with sin in his teaching; act as under the eye of God, in his name; and to uphold his cause, keep the retributions of another world in view,—exhibit truth just as if it could of itself sanctify and save men's souls; get a correct view of man's dependence on divine grace, both as respects the fact of such dependence and the reason of that fact; water the seed thus sown with many tears and much prayer; nor ever grow discouraged or weary in the work. “Who is sufficient for these things?”

4. We briefly mention some *reasons* why so little success is had in the business of moral and religious instruction. Too little good to mankind is *aimed at*, as the result of the instruction given; too little *desire* is felt that good may be done. There is not sufficient *unity* of aim and effect on this point. The good aimed at, so far as any good is looked for, is too generally *prospective* and remote; there is a want of faith in the divine *promise*; preaching *one's self*, and not the Lord Jesus Christ; trusting too much to the naked force of truth, and overlooking human *depravity*; too little previous *concentration* of reflection and study upon the points which the preacher designs to present; an over-anxious reaching after present effect, regardless of future *consequences*; too little *prayer* and holy living to give weight to the lessons taught; *divisions* and jealousies among many of those whose office it is to declare the will of God to mankind:—these (and they deserve to be made subjects of serious reflection,) we regard as some of the more important causes which hinder the success of the gospel, and prevent divine truth from exerting a happier influence over the hearts and lives of mankind.

5. We conclude this article by pointing out *when* it may be expected, that the preaching of the gospel will be more effective in producing its appropriate and desired results among all those to whom it is sent. That it is not very far off there are some cheering indications. It will arrive—when religious teachers shall be content with preaching *only* recorded, or otherwise certain and demonstrable truth, leaving other and doubtful matters out of view; when, of course, different religious teachers shall be *agreed* in what they inculcate, and there shall be no *essential* discordance among them; when there shall be greater *singleness* of aim and purpose in preaching, and that aim and purpose shall be to *honor God and save men's souls*; when the example set us by the *Savior* shall be more faithfully followed in respect to directness,

point, simplicity, earnestness, courage, dealing with men's consciences, and so on, as already specified; when there shall be more holy *living* on the part of the church, christians praying more for their ministers, and walking with a more undeviating consistency according to the rules of the gospel; when ministers, too, shall aim at a higher standard of personal sanctification in their own conduct; and when, by both ministers and private christians, the *Spirit's influence* upon men's hearts is felt to be more needful, and is desired and sought after accordingly; when the *sabbath* shall be better observed, and the tide of worldliness which is now coming in like a flood upon the church shall be rolled back again, and the voice of christian patriotism shall be heard and heeded in our national councils; when, in short, good men of every name and party will rally together in the common ground of christian discipleship, in defense of their common principles, and for the universal diffusion of their common privileges as christians all over the earth. Mankind have never yet seen, on a large scale, what the gospel is adapted to do for the benefit of our race. They have never yet thus seen its intrinsic suitableness to their wants; or its appropriate power as an instrument in the hands of the Holy Spirit to subdue the world to itself. But that time is coming. It will not always linger and be far away as it has hitherto seemed to be. It will come just *then*, (and not before,) when the best and most effective manner of exhibiting God's truth to mankind shall be found out and adopted in practice. It will come just then, when the spirit and example of the Great Teacher shall be faithfully followed, by all who teach his truth, or would advance his kingdom. Let professed teachers of the gospel, then, seek earnestly a greater preparedness for their work. Let them not be content with ordinary qualifications for their office. May we here adopt a more direct style of address to such as are laboring with us in the cause of our Redeemer. Be it ours, brethren, to cultivate all these dispositions and feelings, which will make us more useful in the sacred ministry, by bringing us into a nearer resemblance to our Great Pattern. And especially, let the more youthful aspirants after the sacred office, and those who have just entered it, remember how much, under God, is depending upon the course which they shall pursue, in inculcating divine truth upon the minds of their fellow-men; and let them strive to gain the highest possible qualifications for their employment. The fathers in the ministry will soon be removed from their labors. Those in the meridian of life, also, will soon be experiencing a decline of their strength and the thickening of those infirmities around them which advancing years never fail to produce. To the young we must look to supply the church with faithful and successful champions in her holy cause, when those

now advanced in life shall have retired from the field, or become apparently inefficient through the waning of their strength in the latter stages of their race. Let the young friends of the Redeemer, in the ministry and in the church, gird themselves for the work which is soon to be devolved upon them. We live at an interesting and eventful crisis. American christians occupy a high vantage ground, such as has seldom if ever been occupied by christians in any land before. Theirs is a noble inheritance ; theirs is a most animating prospect ; theirs a post of distinguished honor and of appalling responsibility. Christianity, in this land of light and freedom, is to decide the future destiny of the world ; and, preeminently the christian *pulpit*, in this land of light and freedom, is to tell us (as the means to an end,) what that destiny shall be. If the ministry of the gospel is weak or corrupt, the spirit of christianity in all the churches will feel it, and will wither and die, and the public weal of the nation and the world will sink and go down with it. But if a well trained and faithful ministry, intent only on their own appropriate work of saving souls, shall continue to fill the pulpits of our land, the whole church will feel it ; and the nation and the world will gather increasing purity, and peace, and hope, from it, and the lamp of salvation (which is the word of God,) will speedily go forth, "out of Zion the perfection of beauty," to visit all lands with its benign and cheering influence. Who then among the young men in our churches ; who in our colleges and schools of the prophets ; who among the recently commissioned heralds of salvation already in the ministry, will come to the work of proclaiming God's truth to men, in the spirit of their great Master, studying diligently his example, and showing themselves to be workmen that need not be ashamed ! To such the call of the church, (which we would attempt to second in these pages,) is loud and imperative. May it meet with a ready response in many hearts ! God Almighty ! guide the efforts of thy people, and crown them with thy blessing !

ART. VI.—INJURIOUS EFFECTS OF POPULAR WORKS ON HEALTH.

The Philosophy of Living ; or the way to enjoy Life and its Comforts.—"A man's own observation, what he finds good of, and what he finds hurt of, is the best physic to preserve health." Bacon.—By CALER TICKNOR, A. M., M. D. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1836. (No. 77, Family Library.)

THE PHILOSOPHY *of living* ! What does Dr. Ticknor mean by giving *such* a title to *such* a book as this ? Does he not know the signification of language, or does he affect quaintness ? or would he vulgarize a word which others of better taste respect, and do not like to see degraded ? Does he not know, that *philosophy* deals with principles and principles only, while his book has to do

with matters of fact alone, and facts too of the most common, every-day kind? We are sick of this everlasting quackery in titles. Dr. Ticknor writes like a man of sense, but he does not (and probably cannot) write philosophy, and he knows it. In employing this word, then, as a title to such cogitations as his, on such vulgar topics as eating and nursing, cooking and corsets, the doctor has been guilty of a very gross libel. He has forced a union of things which nature never intended, and which unperverted minds regard with horror. Let this rebuke serve to deter him from the repetition of a most audacious act; and may it prove a useful warning to others who may meditate a similar offense against propriety!

The following extract from Dr. Ticknor's preface will acquaint the reader with the writer's reasons for taking upon himself, in this instance, the responsibilities of authorship:

'The author can assign no other cause for preparing this volume, than the presence and universal prevalence in this country of a malady,—an epidemic,—the like of which was never before witnessed, sparing neither age, sex nor condition, and being followed by the most unhappy consequences. If the reader ask the name of this disease, he may be told, that it is a sort of mania, fanaticism, or ultraism; if he ask where and in what it may be seen, he may be answered, in all places and in all things. It is seen in most of the charitable and benevolent operations of the day; in religious zeal, political warfare, morality, and immorality; in most of the domestic concerns of life, and, in fact, in all the particulars and minutia of living, moving and being. There seems a remarkable propensity in us Americans to run into unwarrantable extravagances; whatever scheme is adopted or whatever plan devised, whether for good or evil, [it] is carried to an extreme. To one who contemplates the present condition of our country with calmness and deliberation, every thing would seem to be upside down, or in a state of the most perfect confusion. He would see men running into the opposite extremes on all subjects, and man warring to the death with his brother or neighbor on some trivial question, while they are no better agreed on matters of the greatest moment. To judge of men by their actions, one would suppose, that a great proportion were mad, and that the world was one immense madhouse. Retrenchment and self-mortification seem to be the order of the day, in relation to food and drink; there being no virtue, on the principle of radicalism, which does not consist in going counter to the appetites and instincts of nature. "Let us be 'temperate in our meats and drinks,'" says one, "and '*use the world as not abusing it.*'" "No," says another, "but let us rather *eat no meat while the world stands*, and as to drink, let that be cold water." Such sentiments have been put forth on the subject of diet, and such ultra measures urged, that the very injury is caused which is attempted to be avoided,—to wit, ill health and consequent unhappiness.' pp. iii. iv.

Now that Dr. Ticknor is correct when he supposes the present to be an age of extravagance,—of fanaticism, if he please,—we think no temperate, sober-minded man can well doubt. A consideration of the various circumstances which have led to this extravagance would lead us aside from our present object; but what may be called its proximate or immediate cause, as it lies in the human mind, may be found in one single fact,—to wit, undue and unnatural *excitement*,—excitement amounting to a *passion*. This excitement is apparent in every thing; in all the great movements and measures of the age. Without it, the progress of extravagance would cease. Without a certain degree of heat of mind, or intensity of feeling, which it is never safe to indulge or encourage, the fires of fanaticism would go out. Every one knows the effect of strong feeling in distorting the perceptions and overthrowing the judgment. It is when under the influence of deep emotion, that men are led blindfold and headlong by passion; and whether this passion is hallowed by the *name* of philanthropy and religion or not, the result is the same, to wit, extravagance—fanaticism. Every one who has felt it, knows the effect of powerful excitement in destroying the judging faculty; and when this faculty is gone, we defy human power to control the movements of the soul. As well might it bind the planets to their orbits, when deprived of the all-pervading and all-controlling influence of the sun. Let any emotion but take captive the soul, and man is not, for the time, a rational being. He does not perceive, judge, or feel like one in the full possession of his faculties. His convictions do not come through the medium of the understanding. He thinks just as prejudice or present feeling may incline him. He is rather the creature of instinct and habit than intellect. The world is familiar with the important truth under consideration,—the paralyzing influence of deep emotion on the powers of the understanding; and though it is not acquainted with its philosophy, it knows well how to turn it to account, when some favorite end is to be obtained and human instrumentality employed. What demagogue, or agitator, or zealot in philanthropy or religion, does not know the virtue which lies in excitement,—in appeals made to the feelings and sympathies of the community, in molding and directing, in blinding or maddening the minds of men? Is a point to be carried? Is a cause, whether of virtue or vice, to be commended to public esteem, and is the current of opinion such as to oppose an obstacle to its favorable reception? Immediately an excitement must be raised. The advocates and “martyrs,” (if need be,) of the cause to be recommended, commence their labors of love by a play on human sympathy, passion and infirmity. They do not even hesitate to make use (perhaps unconsciously,) of the arts of exaggeration and special pleading, assisted by the no less powerful

agency of dramatic and pictorial representations, in order to give heat and flexibility to the mind. It is when in this heated and *malleable* state, that the mind is best fitted to be molded, to be *wrought* into such shapes and to receive such impressions as shall suit the pleasure of the sovereign artist,—he who attends the forge and feeds the fires. It is when the winds are up and the tempest rages, when the reason is overshadowed and the soul elevated and flaming with passion; it is then, that the presiding spirit of the storm—he who knows how to direct as well as convulse the elements—can best display the consummate skill and the form-giving power of a master. It is then, that the great magician is in his element, and regards his ends most within his reach. It is at the time, when feeling has the ascendancy of intellect, that reason or established habits offers the feeblest opposition to extravagance. It is then, that a man will do all sorts of monstrous things, which he may be sorry for in a cooler and more reflecting hour, if fortunately such an hour ever comes.

It will not be thought, it is hoped, that we mean to denounce *all* excitement as dangerous. There is a certain degree of it which is safe, and which contributes much to heighten the sensibilities, quicken the perceptions, to give depth and effect to moral impressions; and which is almost essential to make one feel the force of moral obligation and religious duty. But there is a certain other degree which is not safe; that which renders a man purely a creature of impulse and feeling; for, though, under such circumstances, the mind is just in the state to give the freest admission to virtuous impressions, yet, it is also in a fit state to give the like admission to vicious and all other impressions,—to become fierce with zeal and to run wild with fanaticism. In such a case, the mind is, as it were, in a state of *fusion*, ready to take any form or to be *poured out* in any direction. All the avenues which lead to it are laid open, and the freest entrance allowed to whatever can influence the judgment, move the heart or control the conduct; yet, as all convictions, under such circumstances, come not through the understanding, but by the shorter route of sympathy, prejudice and passion, they cannot be depended upon when reason, the rightful judge in matters of faith discovers, that it has not been consulted,—that it has been hoodwinked and deceived, while feeling, blind if not misguided feeling, has had the direction. It should never be forgotten by those who are most interested to know,—those who would have the world red-hot like themselves in whatever they do,—that this kind of excitement which distorts the perceptions and blinds the reason, is a sword which cuts both ways.

The manner in which Dr. Ticknor has acquitted himself as an author, seems to have been tolerably satisfactory to “a number of literary and scientific gentlemen,” to whom “his manuscript was

submitted;" at least, so says the publishers' advertisement. As for ourselves, we can hardly say as much. In point of literary execution, we do not estimate the work very highly. It displays much bad taste. The writer's endeavors to be witty are incessant, but rarely successful. We can assure him that he has not the bump of "wit,"—a fact which he evidently does not know. We can say positively, (doubtless to the author's unutterable confusion,) that there is nothing so ludicrous in the book, as the writer's awkward attempts to be witty. Though there are in this volume many things which are exceptionable, and even some which a man of refined taste would call execrable;* yet at the same time, we are free to say, that it contains many judicious and sensible remarks, and far less, which is decidedly objectionable, in matters of opinion and practice, than any other exclusively popular work of the kind with which we are acquainted. The writer shows himself the decided enemy of ultraism, at least in some of its more popular forms. He speaks indignantly of certain itinerant lecturers and book-makers, who would make health, and happiness, and virtue consist in the mortification of every animal desire, and in running counter to all the dictates of nature. He has no confidence in the "Graham-bread" system, the vegetable-diet system, and that system of starvation by rule, which has, of late, been urged upon the public with such officious and misplaced zeal, by certain scheming and dreaming enthusiasts and smatterers in "the science of life." But more of this anon.

We have a word or two to say, as to the utility of popular works on health addressed to invalids. Many observing and judicious men, from their habits and station in life well qualified to judge, have an entire disbelief in their usefulness, nay, a firm conviction of their injurious effects. We are ready to confess, that we are somewhat of the same mind. Certain we are, that the general order of books and periodicals of the kind alluded to, and with which the public has of late been supplied to surfeiting, have done extensive injury; far more injury, we verily believe, than good. This injury has been produced in two ways: First, as an operation on the mind, by fixing the attention too exclusively on the health and the organic operations, and by occasioning a kind of feverish anxiety about what we may eat, and drink, and wear, and

* The following passage certainly deserves this epithet:—"However much artificial drinks may be prized, however much extolled, and however much their devotees may bend or *wallow* in devotion, few, under any circumstances, are capable of quenching thirst." p. 88. The italics are not ours. We have looked into what professes to be a second edition of Dr. Ticknor's work,—in which the preface says, "the language is occasionally changed, and some expressions are modified," and "some corrections" made,—hoping to find the "language occasionally changed" in this extract; but the original, in all its *originality*, is preserved.

do, which in some cases has amounted to a true monomania. Secondly, by procuring the adoption of some visionary and vicious scheme of living, and the introduction of arbitrary rules and formula to regulate diet, and to destroy half the pleasures of life, to the entire neglect of the wants of the system and the dictates of nature and common-sense.

The effects of the mind upon the health, and particularly upon invalid health ; and more especially still, its effects upon disordered functions of the stomach and its associated organs,—the complaint most common among the valetudinary, the studious, and the sedentary,—is a matter as yet very imperfectly understood by unprofessional men. True, it is known, that there is a relation, and a near relation too, between the intellectual and bodily man ; but literally nothing is known of its closeness, its intimacy. The dyspeptic has learned from experience, the disturbing influence of intense or long-continued thought or emotion upon the powers of the stomach ; but he is not acquainted, nor can he often be made so, with the effects of too much and too anxious attention to his own disease. He cannot believe, that this anxiety is the most important part of his malady, and that it has the relation of cause in the first place, and subsequently of both cause and effect, of all his complaints. The following case is one of a class. A student, a member of one of our literary institutions, of a delicate constitution and nervous temperament, after a time of unusual confinement and neglected exercise and relaxation, finds his energies impaired, his mind wandering, his sleep disturbed, the appetite capricious, and his whole system, mental and bodily, irritable. He has often had similar feelings before, which have passed off unregarded, in consequence of some temporary change in his habits ; but he now, for the first time, becomes *concerned* for his health. At this juncture, he falls in with a sympathizing friend who tells him that he has the *dyspepsia*, and that he must *diet*. He reads Prof. Hitchcock's work, and other popular books on health, and finds, that, true enough, he has the dyspepsia, and a thousand other complaints which he never thought of. He looks at his tongue, feels his pulse, and enters upon a most rigid plan of regimen. His stomach has of a sudden become exceedingly fickle. He cannot bear butter, or any thing but the lightest, plainest food. Every mouthful which he takes he swallows as though he was suspicious of poison ; and when it is down, he is at special pains to observe how it sits upon his stomach, that he may derive benefit from his experience. He eats as if it were a duty rather than a privilege ; full of danger, but still necessary to be done. He does every thing by rule ; eats, drinks, sleeps, walks, thinks, and even masticates, after certain approved formula which he has found in the books. Consequently, he is full of aches, and acid, and

whims, and wind, and every sort of canting nonsense about his poor stomach. In short, he becomes that which he most feared, and which all his precautionary measures have tended to make him,—an inveterate dyspeptic. It is well known, that medical students of an excitable mind, who have recently commenced their studies, very often have the disease, at least in imagination, about which they happen to be reading. It is well known, too, that the disturbing effects of the mind upon the organs supposed to be implicated in such cases, is so considerable as to produce very serious derangement, even when none, or almost none, before existed.* A learned medical friend of ours, who is supposed to be laboring under some disease of the heart, well aware of the influence of the mind on the organs, particularly when they are already disordered, never suffers himself to feel his own pulse. It is for this same reason—the injurious effects of too anxious attention to one's own complaints, upon such complaints,—that the diseases of medical men are apt to be so much more intractable than those of other persons. The organs will not bear to be watched in their operations; much less will they suffer their integrity to be suspected. Let a man suspect his stomach to be diseased, and watch it as though to prove its guilt, and forthwith disease is present,—the product of his own apprehension. Leave this organ to itself, to do its own work in its own way, and it rarely proves false to its own trust; vex it with unseemly questions, bring vile accusations against it, and then guard it as you

*The influence of an excited imagination upon the animal economy, and particularly the influence of a strong expectation of certain organic effects upon those functions concerned in bringing about such effects, is strikingly illustrated in the remarkable case of the second Lord Lyttleton, (if all the facts in this case are truly narrated,) who predicted, within a few minutes, the time of his own death, on the supposed information of an apparition. An instructive instance, proving the same remarkable influence, fell under the notice of Sir Humphrey Davy, when, in early life, he was assisting Dr. Beddoes in his experiments on the inhalation of nitrous oxide. It is to be found in Dr. Combe's "*Principles of Physiology*," (extracted from *Paris' life of Davy*.) page 258, Harper's edition. "Dr. Beddoes having inferred that the oxide must be a specific for palsy, a patient was selected for trial, and placed under the care of Davy. Previously to administering the gas, Davy inserted a small thermometer under the tongue of the patient to ascertain the temperature. The paralytic man, wholly ignorant of the process to which he was to submit, but deeply impressed by Dr. Beddoes with the certainty of its success, no sooner felt the thermometer between his teeth than he concluded the talisman was in operation, and in a burst of enthusiasm declared that he had already experienced the effects of its benign influence throughout his whole body. The opportunity was too tempting to be lost. Davy did nothing more, but desired his patient to return on the following day. The same ceremony was repeated, the same result followed; and at the end of a fortnight he was dismissed cured, no remedy of any kind, except the thermometer, having ever been used." It is in virtue of the principle under consideration, that quacks and mountebanks sometimes succeed in effecting what are called remarkable cures. Exceedingly little is even yet known of the wonderful connections and relations of body and mind.

would a felon, and it is ready to play all sorts of naughty tricks. There can be no doubt that the manner in which the public attention has, within a few years, been turned to the disorders of the stomach, has done great, irreparable injury to the community, particularly that part of it,—the sedentary and studious,—which from its habits and pursuits is most obnoxious to diseases of this organ. The attention of invalids, and those of weak digestive powers, has been riveted upon that very subject which should have been farthest from their thoughts. Disease has thus been developed and confirmed. Thus a class of cases, which, in former days, were comparatively rare, has become so numerous as to embrace nearly every third person in the community, particularly in the cities. Valetudinarianism has been multiplied a hundred fold. It is so common,* especially in good society, as to have become quite *fashionable*. Broken down health, ruined constitutions, and elongated and wo-begone countenances, even in the morning of life, are now plenteous enough. Indeed, it is almost vulgar now a days to be healthy. It proves, that a man has no refinement, no taste, or is no student.

Of course, we do not consider those lecturers and book-makers who have been so active in administering to the morbid excitement to which we have referred, as contributors to the wealth or happiness of a community. They (at least the *mass* of them,) have proved themselves novices in the matters about which they profess to give advice; or, at any rate, they furnish no evidence of having yet grown to the dignity and wisdom of *teachers*. It has so happened, that these men, as a general rule, have been broken down dyspeptics, whose minds have been directed to the investigation of their own complaints, and who have come before the public in order to give their experience and to discharge what they have called a *duty* to the world,—men who have become exceedingly whimsical and visionary in those matters about which they suppose themselves, from their much study, best informed, relying on, as they say, the sure evidence of fact. Though no one can place a higher value than ourselves on experience, as a source of knowledge, yet, as a general rule, we can think of no more disqualifying circumstance in a teacher of the art of preserving health, than the fact, that he has himself been an old sufferer, and claims to draw his conclusions from his own feelings. It is true, the views of a man may be so enlarged, so liberalized by observation and extensive acquaintance with the laws and phenomena of disease in general,—or, in other words, by those studies

* It is believed that it is not quite so common as it was a few years ago; the excitement about it, following the course of other unnatural excitements, having passed its acme and begun to decline.

and pursuits which are appropriate to the physician,—as to enable him to get the better of that perversion of judgment which is the result of close and continuous attention to one's own complaints. He may perhaps view his own disease with such profound indifference,—so much with the eye of a philosophical anatomist, and so little with the feelings of a man,—that he will judge soundly respecting it. But this coolness, this indifference, is frequently impossible; particularly when the mind itself is disordered, or sympathises intimately with the deranged functions, as in cases of dyspepsia, etc.; in which cases it has been supposed, by some, that the brain is the organ primarily diseased.

The reader will not infer, from what has been said, that we would make popular instructors on health responsible for all the sickness which has appeared since the day of their devotion to the cause of humanity; but he *may* suppose, that we charge them as being a prominent cause (ignorantly no doubt,) of the recent vast increase of stomach-complaints, nervous irritability, and poor health. There are other causes of this increase, which we cannot at present notice.

We are induced to transfer to our pages, in this connection, the following extract from a learned and judicious medical writer :

‘On the whole, after a pretty attentive consideration of the subject, I am strongly inclined to believe, that the popular treatises on diet and regimen, the habitual lecturing of students upon their health, and the newspaper recommendations and prescriptions of food and drink, have been the cause of ten cases of dyspepsia in the place of one which they have prevented or removed. It is said that no susceptible person can fix his attention upon his heart for five minutes at a time, without producing pain or distress, or varying the action of that vital organ. The same is probably the fact with the stomach. * * * * A regular habit of using the bounties of Providence with temperance and moderation, is about all that can ever be enforced upon the public to advantage. All popular directions, besides the rules of common-sense and common prudence, are liable to be misunderstood and perverted, and be carried to extremes, which render them worse than useless,—increasing the evils which they were benevolently, but injudiciously, designed to diminish.’

The *second* bad effect of popular teachings on health, has been the adoption of vicious and visionary plans of living, to the entire neglect of common-sense and the instructive voice of the organs,—an effect which would have been far more disastrous than it is, had it been possible to cause these plans to be generally embraced. The truth is, the great majority of those who are in good health, who have been accustomed to depend on the impulses of nature for guidance in the ordinary affairs relating to health, and who have no reason to suppose their appetites to be

perverted or false, cannot be persuaded to practice the austerities of ascetics and schemers. They will not consent to wear the harness of invalids; to be cramped and shackled by rules which they do not understand, and which they feel, that they do not need; to be governed by precise formula of other men's invention in such vulgar matters as eating and drinking; and it is well that they will not. They are not the men to break their necks, or even waste their time, in chasing phantoms. They would as soon think of weighing the air they breathe as the food they eat; and it would certainly be as rational a thing for *them*. How think you, gentle reader, the New-England farmer would appear, if seated at a table pretending to be *furnished* after some approved recipe of a modern lecturer on health, and engaged in the preliminary business of reading over a printed list of forms and regulations, touching the *modus operandi* of eating and drinking, or rather *starving*, and prescribing the weight and measure of "airy nothing" to be taken, etc.? And what would be *his* emotions on finding himself in such a situation? Would he not feel, that he was insulted and mocked? Would he even be tempted to go over with the mummery of eating? Would he not rather rise from his seat, indignant and mortified, and turn his back upon so beggarly a sight? Thanks to the conservative tendencies of instinct and common-sense, which, in most men, have power to regulate such common matters as eating and drinking, sleeping and exercise, without the aid of dyspeptic monitors, oracles and guides to health, and all the silly prescriptions of empirical lecturers; which are able to dispel the vagaries of dreaming and speculating men, even in spite of the warnings and croakings of alarmists.

Though, in general, the excitement about health, which has pervaded other ranks of society, has not reached the laboring classes, yet, it is not to be denied, that it has occasioned a slight movement, even among them. Even among them, there are those who have caught the fashionable mania; who must have their bran bread, and who can talk current nonsense about weak stomachs and dietetic rules. And just so far as this excitement has pervaded the classes in question, and occasioned the substitution of prescribed forms for natural impulses and native good sense, just so far it has multiplied the "pale faces." As it regards living, and particularly eating, we do not believe, that the New-England farmers, as a body, (a class with which we claim a pretty intimate acquaintance,) can be benefited by any rules which their own discernment will not discover. We do not believe, that, as a general thing, they eat too much, or food of an improper quality; though there are, doubtless, individual exceptions to this remark. There is not a better fed, a more amply nourished, and at the same time a healthier, sturdier, longer-lived race of men on earth; and, in

our way of thinking, there can be no better evidence, that their mode of living is not only agreeable to the laws of the human system, but as far preferable to the manner of life of other races who live on a more meager or less nourishing diet, as the physical condition of the former is superior to that of the latter. As a general thing, their appetites have not been pampered. They are not tempted to excess by a great variety of dishes, by highly-seasoned food, or by scenes of conviviality. They are fond of substantial, but not luxurious fare. It is hunger, that tempts them to eat, and not what may be called the pleasures of the table. When the wants of nature have been satisfied, the table has no farther attractions. In the cases under consideration, the desire of taking food is strictly a natural and original impulse; it is the voice of nature itself,—nature in all her simplicity but imperiousness, prompting to acts of self-preservation, and pleasurable, health-giving excitement. And if that voice is to be disregarded,—if it is to be stifled and scouted as the voice of a demon urging to destruction, and a set of silly rules, invented by visionaries, and followed by fools, to be substituted in its place, and clothed with its authority,—we say alas for poor, helpless, hapless, fallen man! Thou art indebted far more to the wisdom of a few sympathizing fellow-men, and far less to the provident care of thy Creator, than we have ever dared to suppose! If appetite, unperturbed, as we have supposed it to be, cannot be trusted in the cases under consideration,—if it is not allowed to be judge in those things which lie legitimately within its own assigned sphere of jurisdiction,—we defy the advocates of rules and “standards” to say in what case it ought to be trusted. The instinct which regulates breathing is no better, no more deeply laid in the organization, and no more exactly adapted to the wants of the system.

But though, as we have said, the appetites which the Creator has implanted within us, *will* assert and maintain their supremacy in those matters which have been given to their special charge in the great mass of mankind, mauger dyspeptic creeds and Graham bulls; still, there is no inconsiderable class, the studious, the sedentary, the nervous, the irritable, those of shattered health and half shattered minds, who are forever the dupes of fanaticism or imposture; who are always running after charlatans and mountebanks of some description or other, or picking up recipes for broken down stomachs and imaginary ills; and who are ever ready to swallow the last grand panacea which comes recommended by a goodly array of names. It is these men who are the meek followers of such notorious characters as Mons. Chaubert and Sylvester Graham. It is they who are the greatest sticklers for precise formulas. The idea of eating, and drinking,

sleeping, and walking, thinking, and breathing, after some prime recipe, suits their notion of propriety exactly ; for if they can do all these things by some standard,—some standard which they can be assured is the correct one,—they cannot by possibility do wrong, any more than weight and measure can lie. So they argue ; and they argue unanswerably, if those who teach them thus are not deluded and deluding men. We do not dispute, that there are instances in which the observance of general rules may be proper, because there may be particular cases which require the precise management which such rules prescribe ; but we do protest against such observance by all,—even by all who may suppose themselves invalids,—without inquiry whether it may be proper or no ;—and we protest against it for the same reason, that we do against the *empirical* employment of patent, or, indeed, any other medicines, on the supposition that they *may* prove serviceable.

There may be general maxims formed in dietetics as well as medicine, which, to those who have knowledge and skill to apply them, may give useful aid in the management of the human machine ; but these maxims, in order to be general, must be grounded on general principles,—principles which are common to the species, to the exclusion of those particulars in which individuals differ. And to use these maxims for the arbitrary regulation of the very particulars which are excluded by the conditions of their existence as maxims, or as the expressions of general truth ; or to use them as though there were no individual differences, no variety of constitution, temperament, habits, employment, etc., or without the skill necessary to adapt them to these varying circumstances, is grossly to abuse them. The truth is, we regard rules concerning diet, and many other matters relating to hygiene, as entirely superfluous and ineffectual in the healthy, and as practically useless in the valetudinary, because of the limitations, qualifications, and specifications necessary to render them safe guides, and because of the discrimination and knowledge required to adapt them to circumstances and cases. In short, we consider a man, even though he be but half endowed in respect to common-sense, as best capable of regulating for himself the matters under consideration ; or as *non compos* in a most melancholy degree ; or as a proper subject for the physician. The following remarks of Dr. Ticknor are judicious, and may be quoted in this connection :

‘ It is a law of the animal economy, that in order to keep the system in a state of health, the supply must be equal to its expenditures. Were this not the case, the animal machine would soon become bankrupt in health and strength. Were our exercise and the expenditures of the system meted out at a certain ratio, there would be more propriety in

subjecting ourselves to a restricted diet. But the labors of the body and mind vary in degree every day in the year; our occupations are different, the powers of the body are taxed more heavily at one time than at another, the wants of the system are at one time greater than at another; and, therefore, to meet these wants, the supply must sometimes be greater than at others. Besides, we are under the influence of circumstances over which we have no control: our systems feel the effect of climate, season, and atmospheric changes; digestion is impeded or hastened; the action of the bowels is quickened, and more food is, therefore, necessary to equal the demand. The law of nature is, therefore, the only rule applicable to the regulation of the quantity of food; this is the only law which governs inferior animals, and it is not often that they suffer in consequence of its observance. The southerner ties his jaded horse to a corn-crib at night, and he is in no wise injured by satiating his appetite.' pp. 68, 69.

'The advocates of both vegetable and animal diet, believe, or affect to believe, their arguments conclusive, because they are drawn from their own individual experience; rice and hommony, or brown bread, suit one man, and therefore rice and hommony, or brown bread, must be the only proper food for every body. Or another finds, that beef-steak and ship-biscuit agree the best with him, and therefore every body should eat nothing but beef-steak and ship-biscuit. This kind of reasoning is equally false and puerile, and should make no impression on a philosophic mind; for by such logic we can prove, that every article of food is both good and bad.

When two cases are in all points exactly parallel, then what may be proper for one will be also proper for the other; but such cases are seldom to be met with; individuals differ in so many respects, that the old proverb is strictly true, *what is food for one is poison to another*. Unfortunately for the advocates of an exclusive diet, they have all, or nearly all, been confirmed dyspeptics or hypochondriacs; and it is not often, that what is suitable for a sick man will be proper for one in health.' pp. 29, 30.

Every one has heard of the case of the famous Lewis Cornaro,—a name forever on the lips of the sticklers for "standards,"—those who would have a kind of bed of Procrustes to the length of which every man must be stretched who happens to be too short.

'Lewis Cornaro was a Venetian nobleman, who, by dissipation and debauchery at an early age, ruined his health and broke down his constitution; but by the advice of his physicians, he reduced his diet to twelve ounces of solid food, and about a pint of wine per day. This change had a most happy effect upon the debauchee, as it has at the present day, and will ever have on all who undermine their health and the strength of their system by the same course of vice and dissipation. Cornaro lived to be almost a hundred years old, and the conclusion is, by those who use the scales and weights, that every body should live as Cornaro

lived after he reformed,—and so, indeed, they should, if they had [have] previously lived as he did, with the same unhappy effect upon their health. This mode of reasoning is but taking the exception for the rule itself; and by it we may prove any thing, and make of a single isolated fact a general principle, universal in its application. Red Jacket, the famous chief of the Seneca Indians, lived chiefly, as the other natives of the forest do, on game, and exposed to all the vicissitudes and inclemencies of our variable climate. He attained almost as great an age as Cornaro did, and yet, during the last fifty years of his life, he was almost daily intoxicated. Does this prove that we should imitate Red Jacket, in order to live to a good old age?" pp. 53, 54.

Popular lecturers and writers on health have almost invariably overlooked one very important principle or fact, having a most intimate connection with their subject; to wit, the accommodating powers of the human system, by virtue of which it adapts itself to the various and varying influences to which it is exposed. The agents which act upon it and sustain it, are perpetually changing in their force; and were it not for this power of accommodation, we should find disease and death in every variation, even of the most trifling nature. Thus, we are daily exposed to great and sometimes very sudden fluctuations of temperature; but, in ordinary cases, we experience no injury from such exposure. Within certain limited, but not very confined bounds, these oscillations are perfectly harmless. So it is, in a great measure, with the variations in other agents and influences, such as food, drink, sleep, exercise, etc. As it regards food and drink, it seems to make no sort of difference, in ordinary health, whether we take a little more or a little less than our accustomed quantity; even supposing the condition of the system to be the same. As it relates to quantity, we may accustom ourselves to a considerable range with perfect impunity. A man may increase or diminish his appetite and digestive power by a very little pains-taking; so that he may live and thrive on one and a quarter or three quarters the weight of nourishment to which he has been used. In such a case, superfluous matter, if there be any, is thrown off by the various emunctories prepared for the purpose, or deficiencies provided for by lessened activity of the organs and diminished expenditure. All embarrassment of function from trifling and unavoidable irregularities and excesses, is in this manner prevented. It is true, we must not presume too much on the powers of accommodation to which allusion has been made; for there are limits in the scale of dietetic management, which it is not safe to pass; but these limits are not so narrow as many declaimers and defenders of standards would make us believe. We know of many who are accounted gluttons, who enjoy good health and who have even lived to old

age. There are many, too, who live rather abstemiously, or on food not very nutritious, who enjoy a good degree of the same blessings. There are others still, who seem hardly to eat at all; but these are among the delicate, the sickly, and those who take little or no corporeal and mental exercise.

The power of accommodation, under present notice, is possessed in a most variable degree by different persons. It is owing to this difference, that certain persons will expose themselves to noxious effluvia, such as the fumes of lead, copper, quicksilver, etc.; or swallow excessive quantities of alcohol or opium, with entire impunity; while others will quickly succumb under the effects of similar exposure or intemperance.

It is in consequence of this same facility with which the organs adapt themselves to varying influences and circumstances, even those of a decidedly noxious tendency, that the adoption of arbitrary rules of living has not always resulted in injury. Though there is no sort of treatment, that the system will tolerate so ill as that which disregards instinctive impulses, or attempts to break down the organic laws and to stifle the voice of nature; still, there are cases, (and let those who preach the utility of dictetic creeds have the benefit of them,) in which even this kind of violence is *suffered* with little or no injury. But these cases, we have reason to believe, are rare,—exceptions to the general rule. At any rate, we are certain that many, particularly students, have injured themselves by endeavoring to adhere too rigidly to unsuitable regulations. We have known some instances of serious detriment from sheer starvation, or an indiscriminating endeavor to live exclusively on a vegetable diet, in obedience to the precepts of a strolling lecturer on health. Every physician knows the happy changes, and even the sudden restoration to health, which, in such cases, are the result of a prudent return to the laws of nature and a more nourishing and stimulating diet. He sees the same fact strikingly illustrated in certain surgical cases in which fractured bones, wounds and ulcers have obstinately refused to heal during the continuance of an abstemious course of regimen, but which have almost immediately assumed a more favorable appearance after a liberal use of nutritious food and wine. We are not the advocates of intemperate eating any more than we are of intemperate drinking; but neither are we the defenders of a system of suicidal asceticism and monkish self-denial. We believe our appetites were given us to be indulged, and indulged to the extent of their demands when unperverted; and woe to that man who renounces their guidance, or who would root them out as noxious weeds and superfluous monitors. They were planted within us by the same hand that fashioned our bodies, endowed the soul, and gave existence to worlds. They were given for wise and benevolent ends,

and as an essential part of the economy of living systems. They are the lights within us, placed there to guide us in those matters which reason is incompetent to regulate; and he who would extinguish or disregard them, on the plea that science (so called) has discovered surer and better lights, will find, sooner or later, that he has dreamed,—he has put out his eyes, that he might the better see.

We should be glad to speak more particularly of the effects of a too innutritious or meager diet on the health, especially on those who have been accustomed to better fare, but we have hardly space or time. Notwithstanding a frequent effect of a sudden change of this kind is to give temporary elasticity and excitability to the body and the mind, accompanied, however, by gradually increasing emaciation and debility; yet such diet weakens the tone of the stomach, impairs digestion and breaks down the energies of the system, physical and mental. Besides these effects, it is occasionally the cause of two among the most formidable and fatal of diseases, to wit, insanity and pulmonary consumption. Many deplorable cases of the former disease, from inadequate nourishment, may be found among the records of insane hospitals. As it relates to the latter malady, we will only quote the remarks of Dr. Combe, who says, “when from defective food, or impaired digestion, the blood is impoverished in quality, and rendered unfit for adequate nutrition, the lungs speedily suffer, and that often to a fatal extent. So certain is this fact, that in the lower animals, *tubercles* (the cause of incurable consumption,) *can be produced in the lungs, to almost any extent, by withholding a sufficiency of nourishing food.* The same circumstances operate to a most lamentable extent among the poorly fed population of our manufacturing towns; whereas it is proverbial, that butchers, a class of men who eat animal food twice or thrice a day, and live much in the open air, are almost exempt from pulmonary consumption.”

In conclusion of this part of our subject, we repeat, that men in health, who have the smallest share of common-sense, are adequate to the regulation of their own dietetic management; that men who are sick, cannot safely trust themselves to empirical prescriptions, either as it respects regimen or medicine; that invalids do not all require and will not tolerate the same kind and quality of food, drink, sleep, etc.; that in the ordinary cases of the valetudinary, the appetites are not so perverted or so faithless as to render them unsafe to be trusted; that these appetites, as a general thing, are sufficiently true, even in them, to secure against material error or excess; that the sedentary, the studious and dyspeptics do not commonly eat too much or too nourishing food, nor are they in great danger of indulging in that of an improper quality; that the direction to the disciples to eat whatever was set

before them, as well as the command to ask no questions for conscience's sake, was not only an injunction of religion, but a dictate of philosophy, and is as proper now as in the primitive age of the gospel; that those friends of humanity who are forever preaching abstinence in food and talking cant about weak stomachs, and who enjoin their followers to discard nature at the table, and to substitute rules and standards, weights and measures in its place, are misguided men, the authors of more evil than they have ever dreamed; and that it is folly in any man, particularly if he be an invalid, to endeavor to make the whole world eat or starve, sleep and walk, think and breathe, precisely after his own individual fashion or fancy.

ART. VII.—INFLUENCE AND EFFECTS OF FOREIGN TRAVEL.

Change of Air, or the Philosophy of Traveling; being Autumnal Excursions through France, Switzerland, Italy, Germany, and Belgium; with observations and reflections on the moral, physical, and medicinal influence of traveling-exercise, change of scene, foreign skies, and voluntary expatriation. To which is prefixed, wear and tear of modern Babylon. By JAMES JOHNSON, M.D., Physician Extraordinary to the King. New-York: Samuel Wood & Sons.

THE work before us contains much that is instructive and valuable on a very interesting topic. It is the more strongly commended to our attention by the professional character and standing of its author. Dr. Johnson is known to the medical world, as the author of treatises on the "Diseases of Tropical Climates," on "Indigestion," and still better, as the editor of the "Medico-Chirurgical Review and Journal of Practical Medicine," of which and its superior merits it is needless for us to speak. The present work was occasioned by a journey on the continent, undertaken chiefly for the sake of health, in the year 1829. A short extract from the preface will acquaint our readers with the subjects of the volume:

'The work consists of three parts, united by the thread of the subject. The FIRST contains some observations on that WEAR and TEAR of mind and body, which we particularly remark in civilized life, and specially in large cities, together with some suggestions as to the antidote or remedy. The SECOND part consists of reflections and observations made during excursions through France, Switzerland, Italy, and Germany, in the years 1823 and 1829; partly for recreation—but principally for renovation of health. The THIRD division contains some remarks and speculations on the moral, physical, and medicinal influence of foreign, and especially of an Italian climate and residence, in sickness and in health.' p. iii.

A pretty correct idea of the nature of the work, as well as of

the manner in which it is executed, may be obtained from the title page. What writer of the least pretensions to clearness of thought and purity of style, would ever put upon the very front of his book such a loose, indefinite, unmeaning and illogical inscription as we here find? "Change of Air, or Philosophy of Traveling, *being* Autumnal Excursions, etc."! Such an introduction would prepare us for all the looseness of arrangement and carelessness of expression which we actually discover in the body of the work. We could append a long list of the grossest barbarisms, inaccurate expressions, and inelegancies of style, which have come under our eye in perusing it; such as, "*salubrity* of traveling;" "*paucity* of soil;" "object and *end* of an edifice;" "*march* of intellect, of *agriculture*, of *elegance*, and of *convenience*;" "necessary to *minutely describe*;" "*wave* after *wave* of these invaders *perished* by the sword;" "the intermediate *countries* are little better than *hordes*;" "*dirt evaporated* or *withered*;" etc. etc. We might also point out many passages objectionable for their coarseness of language, and obscurity and confusion of thought. But we forbear. We have heard it remarked, how truly we do not say, that gentlemen of the medical profession, almost invariably contract a slovenly habit of style, and that purity and accuracy are not to be expected of them. Why they should be allowed this indulgence, we are unable to conceive; our author, however, deems himself entitled to the forbearance which, for some reason or other, has been thought due to the profession, and we are not very reluctant to concede it; especially as he himself is aware of his faults, and pleads only want of time and the pressure of professional duties in extenuation.

As to the *spirit* of the work, we have more decided objections to urge; especially to the spirit of narrow prejudice, selfish pride, and vanity, which, we are sorry to say, too often sullies its pages. Such characteristics are too often found in English travelers; yet they are by no means the less reprehensible. A well-founded conviction of the general superiority of our own political and social condition, furnishes no valid ground of justification for empty boasting and unfair disparagement. None are perfect. All have their blemishes as well as excellences. Why should a consciousness of excellence in some respects, or even of general pre-eminence, lead us to disparage and obscure what is really good and commendable in others, however tarnished and dimmed by the neighborhood of faults, deformities, and vices? We might expect better things, at least of a man of science; of one who is professionally conversant with the frailties and infirmities of humanity, and who should therefore have learned to treat them with forbearance; of one who makes some pretensions to the possession and exercise of a religion which breathes the spirit of hu-

mility and charity. Yet, from beginning to end, in this work, we regret to see developments, now and then, of this spirit of vaunting, arrogance and scorn, and of prejudice and partiality.

Did our limits permit, we might notice particular instances of spleen and illiberal prejudice; but our object is not to condemn. We wish only to exhibit a fair character of the work, and we gladly pass to that which we consider truly excellent and valuable in it, and which renders it a most desirable acquisition to the reading public; most of whom, we believe, are unacquainted with its merits, though it has been published a number of years. Our readers have already inferred from what we have said, that it is peculiar in its kind. It is indeed out of the beaten track of journal-writing and traveling-sketches. Although loose and immethodical in its arrangement, marred by some blemishes of style, and occasionally exhibiting outbreaks of national pride and vanity, it contains much that, so far as we are aware, is to be collected from no other source,—much that is particularly interesting in these days of universal locomotion. Especially does it deserve the attention of that rapidly multiplying class of individuals, who seek the restoration of health from the benign influence of traveling-exercise and excitement. So numerous has this class lately become, that we are quite confident we do not exaggerate in affirming, the most common motive to travel now to be the restoration or confirmation of health. Not that of the numerous wanderers from home; the majority are the decided victims of disease,—the proper inmates of the sick-room or the hospital. There may be no actual exhibitions of disease. Nature, in her faithful guardianship over the well-being of the system, may not have deemed it necessary to give such decisive intimations of disorder, such fearful warnings of danger, as delirium, convulsions, fever, or total debility. But there may be, and observation tell us there often is, a state of the body which is far from being the condition of perfect health; which relaxes the elasticity of the spirits, chills and dampens the intellectual energies, and indisposes for all active exertion, though accompanied by none of the extreme indications of vital derangement. The heavy eye the thin and pallid countenance, the frequent but causeless sigh, the soft relaxed muscle, the excessively irritable nerve, the stooping posture and the languid gait, are the external indications of this unnatural though common condition. This state of the body, in the great majority of those who seek relief from the influence of travel is occasioned by what Dr. Johnson significantly terms “the wear and tear of the living machine, mental and corporeal.” It results, in his opinion, “from over-strenuous labor or exertion of the intellectual faculties rather than of the corporeal powers, conducted in anxiety of mind and in bad air.” The cause, however, we

conceive, is more general than is here suggested. It is mental labor, ill-regulated in regard to degree, time and circumstances. Excessive, unseasonable, intellectual exertion, without respect to the condition of the body, to nourishment, exercise, air, and cleanliness, or to the state of the moral nature, the peculiarity of the affections and feelings, is a most efficient cause of that mental debility, prostration of spirits, and bodily infirmity, which, in these days of bustling enterprise, busy care, and struggling ambition, are thinning the ranks of our most promising men, in *all* the departments of active life. But however it may be induced, it is a sense of this weakness, this indisposition to effort, this mental impotency, which now drives so many, and will probably drive many more, to seek abroad renovation of health, invigoration of frame, and the recovery of former vivacity and energy. This class of sufferers will read with interest the general observations with which Dr. Johnson has prefaced his volume on "the wear and tear complaint," as he quaintly terms it, and on its causes, indications, and tendencies. The results of an experiment as to the effects of "a constant change of scene and air, combined with almost uninterrupted exercise, active and passive, during the day, principally in the open air," upon a debilitated constitution, will also be regarded by such with interest. The journey now alluded to, was undertaken by the author in company with other valedudinarians, and their domestics, (a necessary part of an English traveler's equipage,) in the year 1823. They traveled in the months of August, September, and October, about 2,500 miles, through France, Switzerland, Germany, and Belgium, for the sole purpose of regaining health. Our author made the circuit entirely "in the open air; that is to say, in an open carriage,—in char-a-bancs,—on mules and on foot." The journeys varied from twenty to fifty or sixty miles in the day, and were generally concluded by sunset. The usual routine of meals, was coffee at sunrise, a breakfast, or *dejeuné à la fourchette*, at noon, and dinner at eight o'clock in the evening. This excursion, with the succeeding one, conducted in a similar way, but over different ground, together with his medical experience and information, and repeated observations of the effects of travel on other invalids, has qualified Dr. Johnson to speak with some degree of authority on this important subject. After having noticed the author's sketches of this second journey, to which he has devoted nearly nine-tenths of the volume, we propose to take up this point,—the *effects* of travel,—and dwell upon it more at large.

Dr. Johnson's second journey was commenced in the autumn of 1829. It led him over a distance of 3,500 miles, in a little more than three months; to say the least, an expeditious journey through such countries as France, Switzerland, and Italy. In his

narration of this excursion, our author indulges but little in mere description of objects, scenery, character and life. His is no guide-book, containing a dry minute of routes, places, curiosities, inns, etc. etc. It is a book of *impressions* and *reflections*. The impressions are generally such as would naturally be made on a cultivated, liberalized, refined and reflecting mind; and his reflections are for the most part sound and just. There is little of the strain after effect, at the expense of truth, which mere descriptive writers of travels so often exhibit. Some abatement, however, must now and then be made on the score of excited feeling, personal prejudices, and peculiarities of habit and temperament; and occasionally, though rarely, a regard to expression, and to style, has led the writer beyond the lines of simple truth. But generally the statements are fair and candid, the descriptions accurate, and the observations philosophical and rational.

His remarks on France will be confirmed by most travelers. Of all countries on the face of the earth, he pronounces it to be the most uninteresting. "From the Pyrenees to the Rhine, from the Jura to the Atlantic, from Antibes to Calais, France presents very few spots indeed, compared with her vast extent of surface, on which the eye can rest with either pleasure or admiration. Her mountains are destitute of sublimity, her vallies of beauty. Her fields, though fertile, are fenceless and slovenly cultivated, presenting a bold and frigid aspect." No pleasant seats or tasteful cottages, relieve the nakedness of the scenery. The villages, towns, and cities, almost without exception, are dull, gloomy, and dirty; destitute of every appearance of taste, elegance, and refinement. The pleasant promenades, parks, or open areas, with one or more of which most French towns are provided, hardly require a modification of this general remark. The streets are narrow and filthy, the houses are crowded together without order, in the closest "jumble," with neither yards or gardens, the exteriors clumsy and awkward, and the interiors gloomy and revolting, from their damp walls, stone floors, uncarpeted, and their loose, open windows, which admit as much air as light. Add to this their abominable system of cookery, the perfection of which lies in compounding every species of eatables in one mixture, properly seasoned with garlic and rancid oil; and the close, pent-up, prison-like diligences,—and you have a picture not very attractive to the ease-seeking and luxury-loving Englishman. If any thing were wanting to make his bile actually run over, it would be supplied in the exactions and impositions, that are *conscientiously* practiced on him out of respect to his British blood. The French *people* themselves receive a more courteous treatment; and his estimate of the French character, as we conceive, is not far from being just. He allows them superior attainments in pure, abstract

science, while he maintains, that they fall far behind their English neighbors in the cultivation and perfection of what pertains to the improvement of life. This we deem a correct comparison of the two nations. The Frenchman is *theoretically*, the Englishman *practically* wise. Science owes some of her proudest defenders and supporters to France. The arts, generally, find there but few distinguished pupils. Indeed, the Frenchman looks only at the imaginary, the *beau ideal*; the actual, the *beau real*, lies below his observation. He aims to realize a fancied perfection, one which exists but in his own brain, and there only because his own views are distorted and limited, and because he is misled by the expression of his own ideas. But for this he makes no allowance. He never conceives, that there can be anything beyond the horizon of his own intellectual vision. Hence it is, that his theories are always exhausting theories. He never dreams that language is a descriptive mirror of thought,—that it is possible for it to convey, even to the same mind, under different circumstances, different images of the same object. He deals only in the *monde spirituel*, and its relations to the *monde naturel*, he does not understand. He therefore fails in all practical wisdom.

The religious and moral character of the French is barely alluded to. A writer, quoted with approbation, remarks, “that it is the want of genuine piety, that is at the bottom of all the faults in the French character.” This may, in a certain sense, be true; but not in the sense in which it would be generally apprehended. True piety would doubtless heal many defects;—would perhaps eradicate that unfeeling selfishness, which, all the arts of *politesse* cannot conceal,—and which discovers itself amid all the bows, courtly phrases, and obsequious airs that bespeak a Frenchman. It would curb the outbreking of those low and degrading passions, which so much sully the French character; check that disposition to maintain, at all hazards, personal rights,—real or imaginary, regardless of all conflicting interests,—which so much impairs his companionable and neighborly qualities; and would cure him of that total disregard of the means in the pursuit of a proper end, leading to those frequent revolutionary excitements which are ever disturbing the peace and security of the country. But there is a constitutional defect in the French character,—the effect perhaps, of the vices and irreligion, that have prevailed so long in France,—one which religion may, in a course of years, gradually wear away; but which the mere infusion of a spirit of piety would not instantly remove. The Gaul is all intellect and passion. The moral sentiments and affections, which tame and refine human nature,—which give to social life its gentleness, loveliness and charm, and to civil life, its steadiness, security and strength, are with him woefully defective. This, we are satisfied, is the true key to

the French character. It solves all its otherwise mysterious developments, and is the index to the history of strange events which have transpired in that land within the last century. It would be interesting to us to investigate the causes of this constitutional phenomenon, which, it is believed all candid and attentive observers will confirm, and to trace its influence on character, as exhibited in the peculiarities of habits, morals and opinions prevalent in France. But this inquiry would lead us beyond our present limits.

The finest views from the Jura are those which embrace the mountains of Savoy, the lake of Geneva and the Pays de Vaud. Beyond is the immense chain of the Alps, with Mont Blanc, the monarch of mountains, at their head, presenting three very different and tolerably defined zones or regions; the first of snow, undulated like the white, fleecy clouds of autumn; the second of a dark blue color, interspersed with many white points or perpendicular lines,—the region of wood and forest, sparkling with reflections from torrents, cliffs and glaciers; the third, of fertility, covered with vineyards, corn-fields, gardens and plantations, and reaching down to the water's edge. Then comes the lake itself, like an immense mirror, sweeping round in a crescent from Geneva on the right, to Vevay and Chillon on the extreme left,—while lastly, the soft and verdant Pays de Vaud, lies directly beneath the feet, overspread with the most luxuriant vegetation, and interspersed with towns, villages and villas. The drive also, through this fairy scene to Geneva, is one of surpassing beauty. "The view of the Jura on one side, and the Savoy mountains on the other,—the pellucid waters of the lake, breaking, with gentle murmur, on the golden sands, along the very edge of the road,—the beams of the setting sun, gilding the snowy summits of the high Alps, and playing on glaciers, cliffs,

‘ And glittering streams, high gleaming from afar,’—

harmonizing with the freshness of the air, the serenity of the scene, the neatness of the cottages, the honest and cheerful countenances of the inhabitants, form a combination of magnificence and tranquillity, that defies the power of description, either in prose or verse."

The entrance into Geneva gives occasion for an outburst of a British feeling of independence. Even in some of the Swiss cantons, that scourge of all travelers, the abominable passport-system, is still retained. The vexations and annoyances of this useless system, makes one's blood boil at the bare remembrance. "Europe is still, in this respect, what it was in the days of Roman dominion,—one vast and dreary PRISON! According to all just and good laws, a man is considered innocent, till he is proved to be guilty. Not so under

the passport-system. There he is always suspected of being guilty, after repeated proofs of innocence." The details too, are as ridiculous and execrable as the general spirit of the system itself. A man "may *dine* in a town or village on the continent, and drink his bottle of wine, mount his mule or his carriage, and proceed without molestation,"—save perhaps, at the gate as he enters or departs. "But if he *sup*, put on his *night-cap*, and go to bed, he is a suspected subject; and the master of the hotel is bound to have him purified in the morning by a visit from a whiskered knight of the halbert, who bows, begs, and perhaps blusters, till the traveler gets rid of his accursed presence by a piece of money! The more petty, paltry and subjugated the principality or state through which you pass, the more rigorous the examination of your passport and baggage, lest you should be plotting against its *independence* (!!) or infringing "on its commerce!" For the necessity or utility of this harrassing passport-system, especially in the interior of kingdoms or states, no one ever could assign me a satisfactory reason. It supports a set of harpies, and keeps travelers in constant fear of losing their credentials,—THAT'S ALL." Of its utter inefficiency in preventing the passage of suspected or dangerous personages through the country, or their egress from it, conclusive evidence is furnished by the escape of the thirty-three prisoners from the prison of St. Pelagie, at Paris, in the month of July, 1835, in spite of all the boasted vigilance and energy of the French police, and notwithstanding that no combination of circumstances could be more favorable for the trial of the system; the attempts of the refugees to escape, being known, the general direction of their flight suspected, and the distance they had to flee being very great,—from Paris to Belgium, Germany or Switzerland. Yet every individual succeeded in evading this efficient passport-system, and getting safe out of the kingdom!

Our valetudinarian physician hastens through Switzerland, along the northern shores of the *Leman*, up the romantic valley of the Rhine by the famous pass of the *Simplon*, into the classic regions of Italy. He stops to examine into that horrible disease, *cretinism*, the disgusting victims of which force themselves upon the notice of the traveler all along the *Valais*.

Of the causes of this disease, he gives but a very indefinite opinion. He conceives, however, that they are to be ascribed chiefly to physical agencies conjoined with certain moral causes,—such as indolence, ignorance, filthiness, drunkenness and debauchery.

The passage of the *Simplon* is well and accurately described, and fair Italy receives the enraptured traveler. With all the infinite diversity of impressions and feelings occasioned by the ever-changing objects, that arrest the attention of the traveler in this

fairy land, there are two moments when he experiences a perfect similarity of feeling. They are the moment of entering and that of leaving Italy. It is difficult to say when the emotions of transport rise highest; at the time of first stepping foot on the ground hallowed by such rich associations, or of leaving forever the land of ignorance, oppression, bigotry, degradation and imposition.

The scenery from Baveno to Milan is rich and beautiful, as it is indeed, through the whole of northern Italy,—although generally of the gentler kind, and somewhat monotonous. The eye becomes weary at length, even of the unequalled luxuriance of the plains of Lombardy and Tuscany; but the earliest views first amaze and then enchant the mind. From the summit of the cathedral of Milan, that beautiful model of the light Gothic, a view is afforded which is perfectly unique. The eye takes in the long chain of the Alps from Genoa to Tyrol on the north, ranges across the broad plains of Lombardy, finding no limit but the hazy sky towards the east, rests on the distant Appenines at the south, and after having swept over a vast surface of unbroken territory, loses itself in the mists, that brood upon the far-distant Mediterranean,—a scene, “magnificent beyond all description or even conception.” The city of Milan itself, presents few objects, that interest our author. Its spacious theater, amphitheater and the imposing triumphal arch which terminates the Simplon road, and serves as the northern gate of the city,—that intended monument of Napoleon’s power and greatness, raised at his expense and under his own direction,—are the only objects, besides the cathedral, which draw forth the philosophic remarks and reflections of our traveler. For its ruins, its churches, its galleries, and what may be called the great lion of Milan,—the famous fresco of the last supper, by Leonardo da Vinci, Dr. Johnson’s short sojourn of four or five days seems to have left him no leisure.

In traveling through Lombardy, the most striking feature in the natural scenery, is the long succession of *fiumari*,—dry channels of rivers or torrents, that every where traverse the country. These water-courses vary in breadth from a dozen yards to a mile, or even more. “They are foaming torrents one day, and empty channels the next. The mountains being often wrapt in clouds, the rains fall there, without any notice on the plains, till the torrent comes roaring along with tremendous rapidity, sweeping away every living creature that happens to be crossing the dry and rugged channels at the time.”

Here, also, and particularly as we approach the Appenines, the grounds present indescribable scenes of beauty and fertility. The soil is cultivated like a garden, and is so fertile, that it produces three or four crops of grain yearly; the hedges and in-

closures are neat ;—rows of elms, poplars and mulberries, with the sweet acacia, traverse every field at intervals of fifty or sixty feet ; while the slender vine reaches from tree to tree, “trained in elegant or fantastic festoons, and bending to the earth beneath a load of the most delicious grapes.” How does the appearance of the people correspond with this picture of plenty, fertility and beauty ? The characters of sickness, indeed, are less apparent on the southern than upon the rice-grounds on the northern side of the Po, but even there, “the marks of malaria are indelibly imprinted on every face ;” and poverty, disease and depression are to be traced in every feature.

The objects which attract the attention at Bologna, are its black, square, ugly, leaning towers,—endurable only as affording from their summits one of the most magnificent panoramas to be met with, even in this land of beautiful prospects ; the university with its extensive museum ; the gallery of paintings, and some of its churches. Among these, the Pinacoteca stands pre-eminent. It is one of the best galleries of paintings in Italy, and is particularly valuable and interesting, as affording the best materials for studying the works of the Bolognese school. The prevailing subjects of the Italian painters, are taken from scripture. “Wherever we look, crucifixions, sepultures, resurrections, descents from the cross, and ascents into the clouds, are mingled with mysterious conceptions, virgin mothers and infantile Christs.” Of the effect of this multiplication of religious representations, upon the religious feelings, Dr. Johnson, as we conceive, judges correctly. The impression made on his mind, is much the same with that made on the minds of most intelligent travelers. “I may be wrong, but I suspect, that the infinite variety in the delineation and personification of these hallowed truths, weaken and destroy the unity and solemnity of those ideas that ought to be attached to them. The eternal virgin and child, under every form, and in every kind of situation which the genius of a Caracci, Guido, Guercino, Giovanni, Domenichino, etc. etc. could imagine, down to the rude daubs and carvings on every sign-post, finger-post, wall and pig-stye in Italy, may create or strengthen devotion in the minds of others, but I confess they had no such salutary tendency on my own mind.” In regard to the propriety and tendency of some of these subjects, there can be no question. Created objects may perhaps furnish fit and proper themes for the artist’s pencil, but to attempt to delineate and paint the Almighty Creator himself,—reduce his infinite, incomprehensible nature to the canvas, and set out his high attributes in colors, seems altogether transcending the province of man, and violating, indeed, the express commands of Jehovah. Yet the eye is often revolted and shocked with these impious representations. Even the chaste and pure taste of a Guido Reni, has not

been able to escape and rise above this corrupt taste of his age. The very mystery of mysteries, the Trinity, he has deemed not too lofty a theme for his daring pencil. To describe these paintings would be to increase the evils of the representation. It would be to degrade and sensualize our conceptions of the Infinite Spirit.

A night on the top of the Appenines, at an inn, where rumor and even historic record says, there dwelt, and for aught that they testify to the contrary, there still dwells, a society, whose law is, to "murder all the passengers they stopped,—to kill and bury the horses, burn the carriages and baggage, reserving only the money, jewels and watches," prompts to a remark or two, on the *safety* of traveling in Italy. "A journey," observes our author, "from one end of Italy to the other,—sometimes with tempting equipage,—sometimes as a solitary, unarmed and defenceless Rambler, has convinced me, that, with common prudence and good humor, a traveler is as safe in this land of banditti, as in any part of the British dominions. An Italian will outwit you,—or, if you please, cheat you, in every possible way,—but he will not murder you, pillage you, or steal from you, if you leave your baggage open in the court of the inn where you stop." Dr. Johnson was probably more fortunate than many others in escaping the arts of the light-fingered gentry, and perhaps his views of Italian dread of theft, are consequently a little overrated. But as to personal safety, with the exercise of common prudence, in avoiding certain locations at night, in some of the large cities, he is doubtless correct in regard to that part of Italy generally traversed by foreigners. Still, the frequent gens d'armes to be met on the public roads in the southern part of the peninsula, will almost unavoidably make the traveler feel, that he is not, after all, quite as safe as he would be on the public roads of England. And as for Calabria, we much question whether a man of prudence would willingly, and for any small consideration, undertake a solitary journey across the country from Reggio to Salerno.

The Val d' Arno strikes the traveler as the very personification of natural loveliness, and to the English traveler, particularly, the sight of Florence awakens strong emotions of pleasure. This city, for some reason or other, is quite a favorite with the British traveling public; and not a few expatriate themselves for months or years, to enjoy the fancied balminess of its climate. Our author ventures to differ from most of his countrymen in regard to the attractiveness of Florence, as a place of residence. The healthiness of its climate he questions, and urges good reasons for his doubts. Its boasted cleanliness he directly contradicts. "There is not a street in this celebrated capital of Tuscany, which does not shock the eye and the olfactories of an Englishman at every step, by presentations of filth,—and that in the worst of all possible

shapes!" "Each mansion constitutes the receptacle or depot of an annual, biennial or triennial accumulation of filth, where an expurgation of the cess-pool generates an atmosphere around each house, that would nauseate, if not poison, any human being except an Italian!" "The city of Florence, then, like too many of its neighbors, is a city of filth, where not a single wave of air is unimpregnated with the most disgusting if not pestiferous effluvia, that imagination can conceive!" This is a picture of Florence,—so much above its sister-cities in respect to neatness and cleanliness, drawn too, by a master,—a man of observation and science,—who directed his attention particularly to this subject, and made minute observations in reference to it in every city and town he visited. What, then, must we think of the other cities of Italy? We intended to collect and sum up the author's testimony on this point; esteeming it a desirable thing to make known the opinions and observations of a writer so worthy of confidence. But the disgusting nature of the subject and our rapidly diminishing space, induces us to forbear. We shall barely allude to it again, in considering its effects on health, and leave our readers to form their inferences from the hints given above; desiring them only to bear in mind, that Florence is a very picture of cleanliness, in comparison with some other cities of fame in Italy.

We cannot stop to accompany our traveler in his rambles over the city; or his visits to the galleries of wax-works,—the pride of Florence, the Palazzo Pitti, with its superb collection of paintings, or even the interesting gallery of the Gran Duca. One glance at the Tribune, which "concentrates, within the space of a small ante-chamber, twelve feet in diameter, a host of the most wonderful efforts, or rather prodigies of human genius," must suffice. It is directed, not to the wonders of art and skill, as reflected from the chisel of Praxiteles and the pencil of Raphael, and the other ancient and modern masters, but to the *effect* of that promiscuous assemblage of subjects,—divine and human, christian and pagan, sacred and licentious,—upon the mind of the beholder. "The eye glances from a naked Venus to a sainted Madonna; from a capering fawn, to a decapitated apostle; from a Diana ogling Endymion, to Herodias receiving the head of St. John; from a wrestling match, to the crucifixion of our Savior; from a knife-grinder, to the 'massacre of the innocents;' from a naked nymph, auditing the soft nonsense of Cupid, to a naked slave, listening to a band of conspirators!" What must be the abiding impression made upon the mind by such a combination of conflicting and opposing objects, all presented in the most attractive charms, that the most exalted and most highly perfected human genius and art can give them? If painting and sculpture can and do influence the taste, the judgment and the passions, and if the proper influence of such

an exhibition be suffered to come in upon the mind and heart, how can it be otherwise than, that reverence for the sacred and holy should be lowered and weakened, and horror of the licentious and gross, be lessened and dissipated?

But we must leave this interesting city, and hasten with our traveler to the great focus of attraction in Italy,—imperial Rome. We pass over for the present his observations on the pestiferous exhalations of the Campagna, and enter the gates of the eternal city. We mount at once to the top of the tower on the Capitoline Hill, and direct our view over southern Rome. It is Rome in ruins, which on this side comes into view. 'The eye, from this elevated position, takes in most of what remains of the splendor and magnificence of the ancient mistress of the world. It is easier to moralize and philosophize than to examine, measure, and describe. The place and the scenes around bring on a musing mood. Hence it is, perhaps, that our author chooses to indulge in a train of philosophic reflection on the politics, religion, and morals, of ancient Rome; the tyranny, oppression, and cruelty of its inhabitants; the frequent mobs, seditions and insurrections; their voluptuousness and sensuality; their debasing religion and their gross superstition; on the emptiness of worldly grandeur and power; the mendacity of triumphal honors, of arches, and columns; and the deep degradation of which human nature is capable; rather than to bring before our minds, by careful, minute description, a picture of the scene before him. We peruse with a melancholy, depressed spirit, these workings of a mind musing on the wrecks of magnificence and grandeur, that lie, majestic in their ruin, around the base of the Monte Capitolino. We feel them to be just and natural; though to a phlegmatic spirit, perhaps, apparently tinged with a little morbid sentimentalism. As a specimen, we give an extract from his reflections on the Coliseum, the proudest relic of ancient splendor, corruption and debasement:

'To feast their eyes on the mangled and quivering members—on the reeking entrails of man and animals—to view, with exquisite delight, the murderous conflicts of the ensanguined arena, hither flowed daily the impetuous tide of human existence, the lords of the creation, the venerated, the god-like Romans! Here took their allotted seats, the sceptered prince and laureled consul—the warlike knight and solemn senator—the haughty patrician and factious tribune—the vestal virgin and stately matron—the tuneful bard and grave philosopher. These and countless multitudes of Roman citizens and Roman rabble, rushed daily to yon gorgeous structure—all for the sake of that **EXCITEMENT** which simple or innocent pleasures could no longer elicit!

Yes! and when the wounded gladiator fell before the superior force or fortune of his fierce antagonist, and sued for life—when the victor

poised in the air his gory falchion, and looked for the signal of mercy or murder—these polished Romans—the fair sex themselves, vestals, maidens, and matrons, held up their hands for BLOOD ; nor would they forego the poignant pleasure of seeing the reeking steel plunged into the vitals of a fellow-creature ! Such was yon colossal slaughter-house, where every ferocious animal that roamed the wilds or haunted the rivers of Asia, Africa, and Europe, was conducted to view, as well as to encounter, with horror and astonishment, the still more ferocious animal—MAN.

Erected by a Pagan—purged of its inhuman rites by a priest—and propped in old age by a pope—the Coliseum shadows out some faint emblematical picture of Rome itself. It was once the stormy theater of bloody deeds—it is now the peaceful asylum of holy crosses. Part of it still stands erect, or renovated ; part of it totters over its base ; but the greater part has vanished. Eloquent in its silence, populous in its solitude, majestic in its adversity, admired in its decay, the ruins of the Coliseum, like the remains of Rome, excite the curiosity of the antiquary—the ruminations of the moralist—the zeal of the Catholic—the admiration of the architect—the sigh of the philanthropist—the sneer of the cynic—the humiliation of the philosopher—and the astonishment of all.’ pp. 163, 164.

From the same happy position, our author next introduces his readers to northern Rome, or Rome *as it is*. But we cannot dwell on this view, interesting as it is ; nor on our author’s speculations on the influence and tendencies of the Romish faith, with its gorgeous temples, ostentatious rites, and its crime-fostering dogmas. We quit the everlasting city, press rapidly over the deadly Pontine marshes, through the dark, gloomy towns of Fondi and Itri, with their “ gaunt, grim, and hunger-stricken inhabitants,” and with our traveler, on the third day, arrive at gay, fascinating Naples. The views from the bay, from Vesuvius, and from the castle of St. Elmo, in Dr. Johnson’s opinion, are the most splendid on the surface of the globe. The climate is exceedingly changeable. Naples is generally associated in the mind with a never-varying sky, always canopied by the deepest and purest azure ; with an atmosphere that might woo a fairy by its softness and balminess ; with an unruffled expanse of waters stretched out before it, and backed by a country that would vie with paradise in its loveliness and beauty. But such a picture is only the imagination of the poet. Naples, like every other part of this lower world, has its vicissitudes of weather, and they differ from the changes to which other places are subject, only in being perhaps a little less frequent, but more violent, more sudden, and more trying to the constitution. Weeks together the Tramontane hides the sun from view, deluges the city with rain, and by the fury of its blasts renders some of its streets actually impassable. This cold, bleak, and shivering atmosphere, a few hours

only may change to the sultry, poisonous Sirocco, bringing on a lassitude and languor which no energy of mind or body can withstand. A few hours more may effect another change equally great, and usher in the soft, balmy breezes of the northwest. It is only then, that the mind feels capable of exertion; and it is then, that travelers describe and poets paint.

Pompeii calls for a considerable share of the author's attention; and well it may. But it has been too fully and too perfectly described by other pens to render any extract here necessary. We therefore choose to follow our traveler back to Rome, and then again to the verdant valley of the Arno, to Genoa, the city of palaces, and thence by Nice and Lyons to Paris, and modern Babylon, as he chooses to call the British metropolis. From this part of the work we merely subjoin one extract, giving a general view of Italy, which contains as much of truth as the extended antithetic will admit.

'The external physiogomy of Italy, as well as of her great cities—and even of her inhabitants, presents more prominent features and singular contrasts than any other country or people in the world. Bernadine de St. Pierre informs us that all contrasts produce harmonies—and hence, perhaps, it is, that Italy is the land of music and of song. There is poetry—or the materials of poetry, in every thing which meets the eye between the Alps and Mount Ætna. Her skies are azure and her hills are green—the sun-beams are ardent, the moon-beams mellow, the stars brilliant—the breezes are alternately delicious and malarious—iced by the Alps, or ignited by the Sirocco—her mountains are lofty, and her streamlets are clear—her rivers are rapid, and her lakes are smooth—her shores are laved by tranquil seas, her hills are shook by hidden fires—the country is rich, and the people are poor—their fields are fertile, while their cultivators are squalid and unhealthy—men and women sow the seed; but saints and angels reap the harvest—the vines are graceful, the grapes luscious; but the wine is too often sour—the roads are magnificent, while the inns are wretched—the country swarms with priests, but is destitute of religion—teems with redundant population where celibacy is the CARDINAL VIRTUE—glitters with gems and precious stones in the midst of starvation—exhibits despots on the plains, and bandits in the mountains—abounds in all the materials of wealth and power, but possesses few flourishing manufactories, except those of monks, music, and macaroni. In fine—the nobility is sunk in sloth, the church in plethora, the populace in pauperism.' p. 188.

The portion of Dr. Johnson's work, which, as we have before intimated, particularly commends itself to our notice, is, that relating to *the influence of travel*, and especially of *travel and temporary residence in Italy*. Our chief regret, while reading it, is, that the author has not seen fit to bestow more time and attention on this most interesting part of his volume, collected and

embodied more information, studied more method, and given his own conclusions more clearly and more at length. But we are grateful for what he has done, and we hope that the subject will be pursued by himself or others until it is more perfectly and more generally understood. We deem it one of great importance, especially at this time, when so many are suffering from the "wear and tear" complaint, and when such a universal rage for foreign travel prevails. Very erroneous notions, we are persuaded, obtain in the community in regard to the effects of foreign travel and residence; and as a guide to correct conclusions, upon this point, the observations, experience, and opinions of such men as Dr. Johnson, are much needed. In the hope of contributing to this end, we here present the results to which our author has arrived.

The *first* topic in this investigation, deserving of notice, is the *climate* of Italy. And here, if we mistake not, the popular opinion is widely at variance with truth. The common impression produced by our geographies, our histories, books of travels, and works of imagination, is, that it is the land of sunny skies, balmy breezes, and verdant soil,—a very Eden, where all physical causes conspire to prolong human existence, and crown it with happiness. If it is supposed, that men do not actually live longer than others of the same race elsewhere, or if the tables of longevity have convinced some few, that life there is even more frail and shadowy than in other parts of the world; this fact is generally attributed to the operation of moral rather than of natural causes, to the ignorance, sloth, filthiness and corruption of the inhabitants, rather than to the defect of climate or the unhealthy influence of the soil. Whereas we apprehend it to be nearer the truth, that this very moral degradation is the effect and consequence of the pestilential action of physical agencies, and can be accounted for only on this ground. Let us look at the situation of Italy in respect to climate. We find it, then, stretching from the foot of the snow-clad Alps to within a short distance of the burning sands of Africa, and separated from the latter only by a sheet of water, which offers no obstruction to the free passage of their sultry, obnoxious blasts. It extends, "narrow and long," it is true, into the Mediterranean, and one might at first suppose, that the air would be tempered by the vicinity of the sea. But to counteract this salutary action, the Appenines stretch their high ridge through the whole length of the peninsula, and effectually bar the passage of both the eastern and western breezes; while themselves covered, during the wintry season, with ice and snow, they send down upon the plains below, their cold, shivering blasts, which come with the greater fury and violence, as the temperature of the plains and the mountains differs so widely. In point of fact,

it is the north westerly wind alone, of all that can sweep over Italy, which brings enjoyment and comfort. With this representation of the situation of Italy before us, we should be led to expect a great *variableness* in her climate. Such we find to be the fact. The deadly Sirocco, charged with the impalpable sands of Africa, and the vapors of the Mediterranean, sweeps unobstructed over her southwestern slope, prostrating the spirits, paralyzing the nervous energy, and relaxing the whole system. In this unguarded, defenceless state, the pores all open, the energies all destroyed, the bleak Trainontane, with scarcely a moment's warning, often comes fiercely down from the icy Alps or Appenines, penetrating at once to the vitals, benumbing their powers, checking the circulation, and palsying the whole frame.

But the climate of Italy is certainly a dry one. Such is doubtless the general opinion. It is sufficiently humid, however, to maintain a constant verdure upon her fertile plains. But if it is more dry than some other countries, if the rains actually fall "more seldom there than in England, they make up for this infrequency by precipitating themselves in cataracts, that form mountain-torrents, and overflow their banks, flood the plains and saturate every inch of ground with humidity." And the severity of the evil only commences when the deluge is over; for then "a powerful sun bursts forth, and rapidly exhales into the air, not only the aqueous vapor from the soil, but the miasmata generated by the decomposition of all the vegetable and animal substances which the rains have destroyed, the floods carried down from the mountains, or the gutters swept out of the streets." We ourselves have known a strong Levanter prevail for more than thirty days almost without intermission on the waters of the sunny Mediterranean, during which, with the exception of only two days, clouds almost uninterruptedly hid the heavens from view, and poured down upon us no inconsiderable quantities of rain and hail. We have known the rain to fall, under the cloudless sky of Naples, for a fortnight in succession; and how much longer the torrents continued to descend, our forced departure renders us unable to say. In Florence, too, fair, sunny Florence, we have known the clouds to descend, for an equal length of time, in incessant showers, not missing a day in the whole period.

We conclude, then, that the changes of climate, though less frequent, are more sudden and more violent in Italy than in most other countries. In confirmation and illustration of these remarks, we cannot forbear quoting, after Dr. Johnson, the following passages from the diary of Mr. Matthews, who traveled in Italy for the express purpose of benefitting his health; and who was therefore led to make particular observations on atmospheric changes, so far as they affect the constitution:

February 11th. The weather is beautiful (says Mr. Matthews) and as warm as a June day in England. We sit at breakfast without a fire, on a marble floor—with the casements open—enjoying the mild breeze.

February 12th. Oh this land of Zephyrs! Yesterday was warm as July;—to day we are shivering with a bleak easterly wind, and an *English black frost*. Naples is one of the worst climates in Europe for complaints of the chest.

March 14th. *ÆGRI SOMNIA*—If a man be tired of the slow lingering progress of consumption, let him repair to Naples; and the *dénouement* will be much more rapid. The *Sirocco* wind, which has been blowing for *six days, continues with the same violence*. The effects of this southeast blast, fraught with all the plagues of the deserts of Africa, are immediately felt in that leaden, oppressive dejection of spirits, which is the most intolerable of diseases.' p. 295.

Let now a chilling Tramontane come in immediately after this "relaxing vapor bath of six days and nights duration," and we shall not be at all surprised at the consequences which actually result, as experienced a few days after, and described on the same page of his diary.

"Seized with an acute pain in my side. Decided pleurisy. Summoned an English surgeon. High fever. Copious bleeding. Owe my life, under heaven, to the lancet. I find pleurisy is the *endemic* of Naples."

So much for the climate of sunny Italy. We pass to a more exciting topic. Were the dangers of a residence in Italy confined to the baleful influences of her climate, it might be enjoyed there with comparative safety. But there is another agency at work, more potent though more subtle and intangible, which slays its thousands where the deadly *Sirocco* and *Tramontane* carry away their hundreds or their tens. It is the horrible malaria. No part of Italy is free from the destructive reach of this inscrutable agency. It is revealed only in its effects; but these discover its presence in the luxuriant plains of Lombardy, and the still lovelier vallies of Tuscany, as well as in the campagna of Rome, and on the volcanic soil of Naples. That horrible disease, the *pellagra*, which prevails so extensively in the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, Dr. Johnson attributes, without hesitation, to "an emanation from the soil;" and even where the *malarious* influence has not proceeded to this degree of severity, its presence is too plainly depicted in the sallow countenance and morbid aspect of the inhabitants. Particularly are those situations, which man has chosen for his habitation, and which the traveler selects for his sojourn, exposed to this destructive agency. "The fairest portions of this fair land," says Dr. Mac Culloch, who has written at length on this subject, "are a prey to this invisible enemy; its fragrant breezes are poison, the dews of its summer evenings are death. The banks of the refreshing streams, its rich and flowery meadows,

the borders of its glassy lakes, the luxuriant plains of its overflowing agriculture, the valley where its aromatic shrubs regale the eye and perfume the air,—these are the chosen seats of this plague, the throne of malaria.”

We do not propose to follow Dr. Johnson in all his interesting speculations on this invisible agency. We shall barely state the *results* of his investigations, and these only as they bear on the subject before us. He supposes it to be settled, that “generally speaking, it is the product of animal and vegetable decomposition by means of heat and moisture.” The physical formation of Italy, allowing of a luxuriant vegetation, and its situation under such a climate, it will at once be seen, is favorable to the extrication of this hidden power. The *fiumari*, also, he considers as very much contributing to its production; and he is inclined to attribute much to the volcanic nature of the soil on the southwest coast of Italy. It is exhaled with the watery vapors by day, and falls with the dews of night. It yields to the force of the winds and currents of air, and is hence often impeded in its progress through a city by high walls and buildings. Open streets and areas, are therefore more exposed than narrow lanes and alleys. Deposits of rubbish, such as have filled up the Jews’ quarter in Rome, seem to prevent entirely its escape from the earth; and where protected by high walls from its approach from abroad, such localities are exempted from its ravages. It does not generally rise to great heights; yet there are exceptions. Our author is of the opinion, that travelers do not exempt themselves from danger by keeping to elevated positions.

Now, what are the effects resulting from the operations of this mysterious but powerful agent? “The jaundiced complexion, the tumid abdomen, the stunted growth, the stupid countenance, the shortened life, attest, that habitual exposure to malaria, saps the energy of every mental and bodily function, and drags its victims to an early grave.” This the tables of longevity also confirm. In Rome, one in twenty-five dies yearly. In Naples, one in twenty-eight; while in London, only one in forty; and in England, one in sixty! But may not temporary residents escape? We will cite a fact, that will show with what degree of safety one may venture within the realm of this tyrant. During the winter and a part of the summer, numerous laborers come from provinces east of the Appenines exempt from malaria, to the Campagna for hire. “A gentleman high in office at Rome, assured us,” says Sir T. C. Morgan, “that every year *one in ten* of these wretches dies of the fever; and those who escape carry the marks of the poison in their swollen and sallow countenances. Very few are able totally to throw off the disease; and repeated exposure to the *malaria*, in successive seasons, never fails to destroy.” The worst

of it is, that the operation of this influence is often secret and gradual. When, therefore, it does not produce such violent effects as these, we are not authorized to feel, that no evil has resulted from exposure. "The foundation of chronic maladies," says Dr. Johnson, "that render life miserable for years, is every summer laid in hundreds of our countrymen who wander about beneath the azure skies of Italy. They bring home with them a poison circulating in their veins, which ultimately tells on the constitution, and assumes all the forms of Proteus, harassing its victims with a thousand anomalous and indescribable feelings of wretchedness, inexplicable alike to himself and to his physician." Still, he allows, that "people in health may wander through Italy in safety, at all periods between September and June," and even thinks, that a sedentary residence during the winter would not be injurious, provided suitable precautions be taken against the climate. But farther than this he would have no one venture, who values his health. So much for the boasted climate of Italy, with the balmy exhalations of its pestiferous Maremma. We cannot forbear adding the concluding remarks of Dr. Mac Culloch, on this point, who says, "this must suffice for the pure, the bright, the fragrant, the classical air of Italy, the Paradise of Europe. To such a pest-house are its blue skies the canopy,—and where its bright sun holds out the promise of life and joy, it is but to inflict misery and death. To him who knows what this land is, the sweetest breeze of summer is attended by an unavoidable sense of fear, and he who, in the language of the poets, wooes the balmy zephyr of the evening, finds death in its blandishments." We must not leave the subject without another inquiry, although somewhat foreign to our immediate purpose. If such is their present desolating influences, what will be the effect of the increase of these destructive miasmata? "I have not," says Dr. Johnson, "the smallest doubt, that the silent and invisible enemy, which has already taken possession of at least three of the seven hills of Rome, will, ere many centuries, reduce the former mistress of the world to a wretched village or den of robbers." "ST. PETER'S, like PÆSTUM, will yet be visited at the risk of life, as the wonder of the *desert*."

Intimately connected with this, is the next topic to which Dr. Johnson directs his attention,—“the *medicinal* influence of an Italian climate.” He considers this influence in reference to several of the common diseases for which a visit to this country, and perhaps a temporary sojourn there, are frequently recommended. Under this head comes, not inappropriately, the consideration of the prevalent habits and customs of the country, so far as they may affect health or facilitate its recovery. We allude to the effects of the peculiar mode of living,—as to dwellings, cleanliness, etc. Of the latter, sufficient has already been said in another

connection to satisfy us, that were the *malarious* agencies to cease their work of death, the filth which is suffered to accumulate in the streets and dwellings in Italian cities, would send forth noxious exhalations enough to breed a pestilence, in which the absence of the malaria would scarcely be noticed. But as it is, it serves to the people themselves, as a shield against the assaults of the malaria. The Jewish quarter, the filthiest in Rome, is also the healthiest. So thick is the incrustation of filth without, that this subtle agent cannot penetrate to the living man within ! But this fact will not render this poisonous effluvia a less formidable evil to the foreign invalid. The dwellings are as ill adapted as they could be, to aid the endeavors of the invalid who has courted the medicinal influence of an Italian climate. They are all constructed in reference to the heat, with no provisions at all for alleviating the cold or preventing dampness. Some exceptions may exist in the largest and most frequented cities, where foreign taste has introduced changes in the present style of living. But generally, the houses are of stone, with stone stair-cases and stone floors. The casements of the windows are loose and open, admitting freely the cold, damp air. Every thing within, is therefore penetrated with moisture. There are few, if any, provisions for warming the apartments, except, perhaps, the smoking *caldanini*, or open pan of coals, filling the room with their dangerous gases ; and last, not least, there are no carpets to protect the feet from the cold, damp stone floors, and give the gloomy chamber one cheering sign of comfort. Some of the comforts of *civilized* life, may, as we have said, be found in the large cities ; but in the country towns and villages, through which the traveler passes, and in which he must necessarily take up an occasional night's lodging, or remain in his carriage, he must not presume to look for them. We are not surprised, therefore, when we hear the invalid, Mr. Matthews, declare, "that during the time it lasts, winter is more severely felt here than at Sidmouth, (England,) where I would even recommend an Italian invalid to repair, from November till February."

To one predisposed to *pulmonary* affections, the great variation of temperature in different streets, and in different situations on the same street, presents another ground of danger. This variation often amounts to twenty degrees, or even more. While your neighbor directly opposite, on the Lung 'Arno, in Florence, is sitting with his window up, apparently enjoying the mild, warm breeze of summer, you may be shivering over a miserable faggot fire, endeavoring in vain to protect yourself from the damp, penetrating and wintry chilliness of the atmosphere. The conclusion at which Dr. Johnson arrives, after an extended examination of these causes, and of the nature of diseases of the chest, we give in his own words :

'The sum total of our knowledge, then, on this important point, appears to stand thus : I. In DELICATE HEALTH, without any proof of organic changes in the lungs,—in what is called a "tendency to pulmonary affection,"—a journey to Italy, and a winter's residence there, under strict caution, offer probabilities of an amelioration of health: II. In cases where there is a suspicion or certainty of tubercles in the lungs, not softened down or attended with purulent expectoration, an Italian climate *may* do some good, and *may* do much harm; the chances being pretty nearly balanced: III. Where tuberculous matter appears in the expectoration, and where the stethoscope indicates that a considerable portion of the lungs is unfitted for respiration, a southern climate is more likely to accelerate than retard the fatal event,—and takes away the few chances that remain of final recovery.' p. 305.

In regard to *bronchial affections*, our author at first seems to be of the opinion, that benefit may be realized from a winter's residence in Italy. But of this, he afterwards expresses some doubt, and is at a loss to see how a climate, "in which acute inflammation of the lungs appeared more violent and more rapid in its course, than in England," can be supposed to possess the property of relieving inflammation of the tubes leading to the same organ. Some little experience and observation lead us to coincide with him in his more matured opinion.

As to *nervous disorders*, he deems it clear, that the climate of Rome is "extremely hostile to the brain and the nervous system." While a journey *may* be of service, it is very questionable whether a residence there *would* be productive of any benefit. To support this opinion, he appeals to the extreme morbid sensibility by which the Romans are characterized; evincing itself in their peculiar sensitiveness to perfumes,—the odor of the most pleasant flower often throwing a Roman lady into convulsions,—and in the frequency of sudden deaths.

There is another large class of invalids who are prone to try the efficacy of a residence in Italy, to whom Dr. Johnson is at a loss what to say. We allude to those who are troubled with "disorders of the digestive organs." He seems to have a dread of the acid wines and oily dishes which they must there take into the stomach. The air, too, of the Campagna, is always depressing, and the Sirocco is murderous. Malaria, moreover, he thinks a leading cause of dyspepsia, and warns all dyspeptics to shun exposure to its influence. Even in winter, these pestilential miasmata may be exhaled in sufficient quantities to lay the foundation of permanent disorders.

Of the beneficial influence of traveling-exercise, in the promotion of health, he entertains no doubts whatever. And perhaps no country in the world offers stronger attractions, in this respect, than Italy. The causes of excitement are so numerous,

and the sources of healthful enjoyment so abundant, that scarcely an improvement in this particular could be desired. Every thing which can gratify the senses, please the eye, charm the ear, or stimulate the mental faculties to pleasant action, is here found in the richest abundance. Even the annoyances and vexations to which a traveler is subject, from police men and passports, *douaniers* and beggars, impositions and frauds of *vetturini*, postillions, landlords and servants, for a while arouse and entertain, from their novelty and the insight they afford into character and customs. A journey in Italy, it may therefore reasonably be expected, will considerably increase the ordinary benefits to health, which result from the healthful excitement of traveling. The drawbacks are the pernicious influence of the Italian climate, and of its poisonous *malarious* exhalations and effluvia, and the exposures from a deprivation of customary comforts. How far these will probably counterbalance the beneficial tendencies of travel, must depend upon the constitution, habits and condition of the individual himself, and the season and length of time he proposes to pass in Italy. He should especially avoid spending the summer there; and even in winter, except the consumptive,—who will be liable to great exposure from the damp walls, rooms and furniture of country hotels, and who therefore should rather fit up for himself quarters furnished with provisions against cold and dampness, customary in cold climates,—the great body of valetudinarians will do well to take Dr. Johnson's advice and "keep moving." Change of air, with the succession of pleasurable excitements, which change of place in a country like Italy always brings with it, in promoting serenity and evenness of temper, elevating and soothing the spirits, reducing an excessive and morbid sensibility, augmenting the powers of assimilation and digestion, and exerting a healthful action upon the blood,—these, will do more towards the restoration of impaired health, where there is no organic disease, in one season, than a fixed, stationary residence in the most healthy climate under the wisest precautions, and the most guarded attention to diet, etc., will accomplish, in a much greater length of time. We speak of a majority of cases of debility. Exceptions doubtless exist; and the invalid, who purposes a resort to travel as a means of restoration, must consult his own condition, the causes of his infirmity, its degree and nature, the influence of different climates and states of air upon his system, the tried effects of change and travel, and, above all, prudent and experienced physicians.

The next and closing section of Dr. Johnson's work, is devoted to the *moral* and *religious* "influence of an Italian climate and residence." This is a topic, which, though it little attracts the attention of travelers, and rarely enters into the mind, when considering the propriety of a foreign tour, is yet one, that should

engage the serious thoughts and consideration of all who attach any value to a delicate moral sense, to correct habits and to an elevated christian spirit. For it may be a question, after all, whether the physical and intellectual gain, may not be more than counterbalanced by the moral loss which he may experience. While looking at the invigoration of frame, the enlargement of intellectual views, and the increase of mental and physical energy which he may hope to realize, the tourist may easily reconcile himself to the expenditure of his hundred dollars a month,—the usual expense of a moderate traveler in continental Europe,—and of his ten to twenty months of time, which a tour in the old world commonly occupies. The elements in this calculation are more tangible ; certainly in deciding this point, more aid can be derived from the known fruits of others' experience. But the moral part of the calculation is more difficult. Travelers have not so fully recorded the effects which have resulted to their spiritual and moral character. These effects depend more on individual temperament and habits ; and vary more with circumstances. Still as the cultivation of the moral feelings is an object far above the culture of the physical or intellectual system, no christian will throw himself into a situation where his character, in this respect, will be so seriously affected,—beneficially or otherwise,—without giving the subject serious consideration. We propose, in this connection, to throw out some hints, that may be of service to those who are considering the question of a foreign tour.

We would remark at the outset, that, beyond all question, material benefit *may be* realized from a temporary residence in Italy or France. We doubt whether men are ever placed in any situation whatever, except from their own fault, where they *may* not improve their moral character. We do most fully believe, that if a man goes through the sea of corruption, which overspreads nearly the whole of continental Europe, and withstands the tide of polluting influence, which must unavoidably be met there ; if he will do this successfully, and come off with no delicate sensibility blunted, no pure feeling sullied, or elevated principle shaken ; no holy purpose forgotten, and no high aim lowered, he will have attained, we hesitate not to say it, a strength of moral character which will carry him successfully through all the possible shocks to which subsequent life may expose him. We will go farther, and affirm our belief, that individuals *have* passed through this ordeal, and come out more firm, more pure, more moral and virtuous than before. But the question here, is not of possibility but of probability ; not of particular exception, but of general fact. How far may a man go without danger ? How far may he go without fault ? There are some general principles which may aid us in settling these questions. One is, that familiarity with moral degradation

uniformly lowers and contaminates moral character. This is a maxim too old and too generally received, to require proof or illustration. Whether for the benevolent aim of preventing the encouragement and countenance to vice which the mere presence and privy of others, and especially of the virtuous affords, or for other wise and good reasons, such is the general law under which our Creator has placed us. We have no time nor inclination to philosophize at length on this point; but we would call the reader's attention to one general fact, which seems in part to account for this moral phenomenon, and which has generally been overlooked. It is, that the standard of morality, and even of piety, with most, and indeed we may say, with all, is to a greater or less degree arbitrary and changeable. Even when taken from the perfect and absolute standard of the word of God, it will vary with the mental and spiritual illumination under which it is contemplated; and in proportion as a man becomes more conversant with the principles of the bible, and imbibes more of its spirit, will his ideas of the elevation of its standard of action be raised and exalted. Indeed, nothing is more common than for men to take the standard by which they *practically* regulate and measure their conduct, from the actions of their fellow-men. Do they excel their neighbors? they are prone to think they do well, or are, at least, not so seriously at fault. Now we do not pretend to justify or commend this course. All we wish, is, to set forth the fact, as a means of exhibiting more clearly from it, the operation of the principle, or maxim, which we have proposed. Place a man in a society where the standard of morality is low, and however correct his principles and firm his purpose, unless he is more than man as we see him in actual life, he will imperceptibly, but certainly, make some approximations, greater or less, to the standard prevalent around him; unless,—and we know of no other exception,—he constantly employs himself in striving to elevate that standard, and raise it nearer to a higher and more perfect one, thus ever kept in view. If there are other exceptions, they will not shake the position, that such is the ordinary course of things, and such as is to be counted on in solving the question now before us.

Another principle of importance in this investigation, is, that men are, in a great degree, dependent for the support of correct moral and religious feelings, on the presence of *restraints*. Take away the walls, barriers and hedges which are thrown about the path of rectitude and purity, in a land of civilization, morality and religion; remove the obstacles to moral and religious declension, which arise from a sense of character, a regard to the opinions of others, a fear of salutary laws, and numerous other sources, unnecessary to mention, and the probabilities of error and defection are fearfully multiplied. Principle, which with these restraints, seems firm

as a rock and stable as the hills, would often be found to reel, and totter and fall. Even corruption and malignity, in such a community, are forced to put on the dress of purity and gentleness; and we doubt not, from the known influence of the exterior life on the internal feelings, do actually lose some of their strength and virulence.

We mention only one other maxim, that men are dependent, to a very great degree, on aids and resources out of themselves, for the support and increase of virtuous principle and feeling. We need not add a word to illustrate the force of this remark. Let any one consult his own experience, and call to mind the experience of others; let him cast an eye over the almost innumerable means, which he enjoys in this land, of promoting knowledge, virtue and purity; let him estimate the individual influence of each, and then the combined influences of all, and he will readily see and feel the extent and force of this truth.

With these principles to aid us, let us now glance at the objects with which the mind of the foreign traveler and resident necessarily becomes conversant, and which tend to influence moral character,—the manners, habits, practices and opinions with which he comes in contact abroad.

We have once or twice before, alluded to the habits of cleanliness, or rather of uncleanness, in Italy. We pass over the direct effect of these habits, and touch at this point only to enable ourselves to get more full and correct notions of the want of delicacy and purity of manners, which must prevail in such a country. For, as our author correctly observes, “where general cleanliness is neglected, we can hardly be surprised at personal *malpropreté*.” The nature of the subject, forbids us to dwell on this topic, or to do more than simply give very general and shaded views of the state of manners. We can only *refer* to what Forsyth says of Florence, the fashionable residence of the English in Italy, found on page 316, as quoted by Dr. Johnson. It is doubtless a true picture of Italian manners. Of Naples,—lovely Naples,—about which association has thrown every possible charm, in the minds of many; he remarks: “I am afraid to believe all that I hear of the licentiousness of Naples; but I see enough to make me think nothing impossible. The plain speaking of the Neapolitan ladies is truly surprising; they call every thing by its right name, without any circumlocution; and in the reality of a story, whatever be the character of the incidents, there is nothing left to be collected by inference, but the facts are broadly and plainly told, with the most circumstantial details.” We forbear any remarks respecting the probable effects on purity of feeling, which free intercourse with such society must, according to all human experience, unavoidably produce.

We may form some idea of the state of society in a given coun-

try, from the remedies and preventives resorted to, for healing or avoiding existing or apprehended evils. What, then, must we think of the moral atmosphere which prevails in a community, where common prudence and affection compel parents to shut up their daughters in prison-like confinement, and never suffer them to appear in company or in public, to go to church or cross the street, without the presence of a guardian, till the articles of marriage are actually signed? Can we at all wonder, that the abominable custom of *cecisbeism* should every where prevail; be authorized and favored by the public taste? Even in Florence, we are told, the *cavaliere servente* is a necessary appendage to every lady of consequence. Without him, she "cannot appear in fashionable company or before God." To him, free access is allowed at all times, by day and by night, without the necessity of notice, to the house and to all its apartments. Even the private chamber is not closed to him, at any hour; and liberties are allowed him, which the husband would not dream of taking. This practice is open, avowed and common. "I have seen," says lady Morgan, "a matron-mother enter a Florentine assembly between her *cavaliere servente* and her young and innocent bridal daughter, who was thus sent into the world with this fatal example before her eyes. No exposure, no reprobation is adequate to this shameless and unblushing libertinism; to such a mother as this, the hapless victim, of circumstances, the libertine of necessity, is a respectable personage." Now we do not at all wonder at this state of things. It is what might properly and reasonably be expected from such a condition of society as requires that incarceration of young females, at which we have hinted. They consider themselves in bondage, and long to be free; and to gain their liberty, they are willing to accept the proposals of the first man who offers; of one they never saw; and whom they may not and cannot love. Why should they not be expected to seek out and enjoy the company and favors of one they can esteem, or with whom they can have some sympathy; especially when public opinion lifts no voice against the impurity and wickedness of such connections?

We turn to another feature of Italian society. It is the prevalence of *gambling*. Go where we will, into whatever society, in the meeting of neighbors, the more public *soirée*, the fashionable party or ball, and there, and every where, we see all, old and young, male and female, collected around the gambling board. It seems almost a necessary thing in society. To omit it and avoid it, is to be singular, and provoke observation and reflection. Few foreigners, who go into society, have resolution enough to withstand the pressure of temptation thus presented.

We must pass by the prevalence of more decided crimes, such as assassinations, robberies, thefts, etc. etc. We cannot, however,

forbear asking, What must be the state of that society in which a man cannot go through the most public streets in open day, without having his pockets picked; and this in sight of dozens or scores who coolly look on, see the act, and make no kind of effort to prevent or punish it, or even to assist in the recovery of the spoil? Is a key needed to unlock this mystery? Go to that church a few feet distance, and there, on the door or the first rich column which meets the eye, it may be found labeled **PLENARY INDULGENCE!** Every church is a veritable sanctuary for crime; and there are few crimes which are not committed within its protecting walls. The theater is a place of unsullied purity in comparison with this haunt of vice and iniquity. But we must here pause a moment to advert to the nature and degree of an influence which flows in from another source; we mean the objects collected in the public museums: and here we would be distinctly understood. We admit, that there may be, and often is, a feverish sensibility on this subject, and as often, perhaps, a prudery and an affectation as detestable as the former is weak and pitiable. We admit further, that the mind *may* so lose itself in the design of the painting or sculpture, or in the perfection of its execution, as not at all to perceive any evil effects from what would otherwise disgust or pollute. We believe, moreover, the habit may be formed of so contemplating pieces of art, in which exposure has, for some reason or other, been deemed necessary or desirable by the artist, that no indelicate or wanton idea or feeling will be suggested or awakened. When we think of the numerous females of delicacy and purity who visit these museums, we are forced to this conclusion. Still, it may be asked, what is the *tendency* of such exhibitions? Is it to purity, to delicacy of sentiment? May it not be true, after all, that some considerable degree of firmness and moral and religious principle is necessary to prevent an injurious effect? May not one reason, why refined and genteel ladies will endure to spend their time over these exposed forms, be, that their own sensibility has been unconsciously blunted and benumbed through the very natural effect of such exhibitions, often repeated? However this may be, our business is to state facts, which will enable every man to judge for himself, how far his mind and heart may be endangered by such visits. Just look in, then upon the paintings and statuary collected in these galleries and museums, and judge what must be the proper influence of those undraped statues and forms, representing the various scenes and personages of a licentious heathen mythology; plain, open, undisguised, as is the language in polite society there; attracting the gaze and remarks of groups of individuals of all ages, classes and both sexes, who stand and criticise freely each look and expression, each feature, limb, and muscle, each attitude and posture? Think of these mixed as-

semblies gazing together with a critic's eye at the perfectly nude figure of an Apollo or an Hermaphrodite, those boasted wonders of the sculptor's art, or directed to the naked form of a Venus painted in all the grossness of the lowest sensuality, or passing over the features and limbs of an obscene Faun or Satyr, or resting upon the hardly less disgusting representations of a Cupid and Psyche,—the common objects of an Italian museum or gallery,—yea, the common decorations of an Italian nobleman's house; think of this, and judge what must be the proper effect on pure, refined and elevated moral sentiment,—what on already partially polluted and degraded sense? Who can wonder, that familiarity with such scenes and objects, should soon induce an application to some distinguished artist for admission to the study of the *living* model, who, for a few pauls, will exhibit herself, in *puris naturalibus*, in all the attitudes and postures in which the taste of the artist usually leads him to represent the human form?

Of the *direct* temptations to vice, which assail the traveler abroad, when unmanned and overpowered by this tide of corrupting influence, we cannot here speak. In regard to their *power* and strength, we shall only alledge the testimony of a man who well knew, from experience, how irresistible they were, and whom we once heard, in a foreign city, declare with no small degree of earnestness and seriousness, his full conviction, that human nature is utterly unequal to the task of holding out against such a sweeping flood of pollution and temptation. This was from a man brought up under a religious influence in New-England; the father of a pious family, a man of extensive information, and, in this country, of unsullied and unsuspected character. Unhappily for him, he knew not the power of religious principle, and what a shield this may be against the assaults of vice. Well might he believe, that nothing except this could secure any one from being led astray.

But these are not the only snares in which the feet of the unwary and unstable may be entrapped. Numerous, we had almost said innumerable questions of casuistry arise, so difficult to settle, so perplexing, that one is in danger of feeling as if there was no distinction between right and wrong; or as if the line is so narrow and so obscure, that any attempt to avoid crossing it is useless. One frequent class of these puzzling questions is involved in the general inquiry, how far a person may conform to the practices and habits which prevail abroad, among residents and travelers? With regard to many of the usages and customs, he has no doubt of their character and tendency. But where is the line to be drawn? At home, these practices are well understood in their nature and bearings; and an enlightened conscience determines at once what may be followed and what shunned. But here are many different usages unheard of before; the circumstances are entirely changed,

and the perplexing question arises, Is every thing necessarily wrong abroad which is so at home? There are many customs and practices, which are innocent in themselves, and which become wrong only because they tend to evil from their being perverted by corrupt men. Must a man avoid all such abroad, as he would at home, for fear of giving countenance to vice? He has, perhaps, refrained from the use of distilled and fermented liquors; must he, therefore, deny himself the use of the mild and pure wines of Italy, and limit himself to its impure and often unwholesome water? He has avoided the theater at home, because he deemed it the school of vice; shall he, therefore, deprive himself of the pleasure to be derived from Italian concerts and operas, when he knows, that if there is a spot peculiarly free from impurity, in an Italian city, it is the larger theater? At home he has reprobated the evils of the fashionable ball and levee; shall he then, abroad, avoid the company of the great and the distinguished, or even shut himself out from all society? Another question equally difficult frequently occurs: How far does a laudable desire to obtain a knowledge of foreign customs, habits and character, justify him in passing limits which, otherwise, he might deem it sinful to transgress? Such are specimens of the questions in casuistry which are perpetually arising to perplex and perhaps to stumble the conscience. Now it may seem an easy thing to sit down in one's closet or study, and settle these and innumerable other questions, that come under the same category. In a pure and healthful moral atmosphere, it may appear easy to do it, unbiassed by prevailing corrupting example and habits. But it is a very different thing to do it when the power of temptation is upon the mind, obscuring the lines of truth and error, of right and wrong; when the moral sense is already chilled and blunted by unavoidable familiarity with vice in its most deceitful and alluring forms. Let all these things be considered, and it will not appear strange, that the young and inexperienced, especially such as are unfortified by religious principle, sometimes find themselves tripping, stumbling, and so acting, as in after-hours of soberness, when the glare is off from their eyes, they will reflect upon with shame and sorrow. Neither need we at all wonder, that the tourist, with all his care and anxiety, caution and firmness, on his return finds his conscience less tender, his heart less pure, and his spirit less elevated and heavenly in its aims and aspirations; nor that the mind, before inclined to scepticism, is more deeply entangled in the snares, and lost in the mazes of unbelief and error. Of all these things should one be aware, who is counting the cost of a journey or sojourn in Italy, and govern and prepare himself accordingly.

We approach a still more important part of the subject. What is the influence of foreign travel and residence on *religious* char-

acter? So far as piety is affected by a sound moral state, and dependent upon it, we may form some notion how it may be influenced, by the general views already presented. Let us glance at the influence of the religious aspect of things on the mind of the traveler. The first thing that will strike his attention, is the *effects* of the religion there professed and inculcated. He is surrounded by a people sunk in the lowest degradation. Want, wretchedness, and misery, like frightful specters, stand ever before his eyes, rendered, if possible, still more frightful by the glaring contrast with the pomp and splendor of the priesthood. Ignorance, the most deplorable, he learns, it is the declared aim and tendency of this religion to maintain; and this object, he sees, is but too fatally accomplished. A low and grinding superstition, and a blind and malignant bigotry, ever ready to light up the fires of the inquisition, sway the passions; the prevalence of which brings the whole body of the people under the full control of selfish and ambitious priests and hierarchs. Vice, undisguised and shameless, in the most debasing forms, stalks forth unopposed over the land, which is literally immersed in a sea of corruption, misery and death. Such, he perceives, are the effects,—the natural effects,—of the religion of Italy; and these effects every where force themselves upon his view. He looks at the rites, the ceremonies, the worship of the church, and he turns away in disgust and horror at their hypocrisy and heartlessness. Every where he finds them intimately associated with vice and crime. The cut-throat and highway robber cross themselves and mutter their invocations to the virgin, as they set out on their work of death. The prostitute and thief make their customary weekly visits to the church, and mingle in the devotions there with as great degree of sincerity and eagerness as the sanctimonious priest, who officiates in his robes of white; mumbling over in an inaudible voice the customary service, which, perhaps, he himself understands no better than the mute, gazing spectators, and running hurriedly through the routine of unmeaning forms and ceremonies of the mass. Or he sees the miserable, deluded victim of this crafty priesthood, prostrated on his knees before a pictured saint, or canonized pagan image, jabbering a series of prayers as unintelligible to him as if composed in the tongue of an American savage; his eyes wandering about while the lips continue their rapid motion, staring at every stranger who enters, with perhaps a prying look into his pockets in search of plunder, and every now and then turned, with a heavy sigh, on the string of beads in his hands, to count how many more must be slipped along ere the disagreeable penance is finished. Worship, due only to God, is every where idolatrously offered to men of real or supposed sanctity, or who have deluded mankind into a belief of their miracu-

lous pretensions ; while it is to the blessed virgin, and other saints, rather than to God, that the blinded populace are taught to look for prosperity and support in this life, and for salvation and comfort in that to come. The sabbath,—the hallowed day of the Lord,—of less sacredness than a saint's day, after a half an hour in the morning spent in the mummerly of a mass, is devoted, *religiously* devoted, to recreations and amusements of the rudest and most debasing kind. Convents and monasteries, the refuges of sloth and every form of sensuality, are scattered over the land, an almost insupportable burthen on an indolent and impoverished people. And the sensualizing, debasing doctrines of this putrid church ; of a purgatory, held up as a frightful bugbear before the weak and ignorant, to scare them into compliance with arbitrary exactions ; of indulgence and absolution ; of the impropriety and wrongfulness of exercising private judgment ; of miraculous agency, transubstantiation and infallibility, come in to complete the humiliating picture of this religion.

With such a picture ever before the eye, what must be the bias and direction given to the religious feelings ? What intelligent mind can look upon such a religion, as a whole, manifesting itself in such forms and effects, and recognize it as the religion of truth,—the religion of the word of God ? And what mind works so accurately as to separate between the true and the false, or suffer itself to kindle and glow before the one, and recoil with disgust and horror from the other ? Is there not danger, especially in a mind at all unsettled as to the great truths of religion, of its becoming more and more sceptical and averse to all religion ? And will not familiarity here with hypocrisy, monkery and superstition, as in other cases, exert its unhappy influence upon the feelings and heart ?

Sum up, now, the influences which the traveler and resident in Italy must necessarily encounter ; the influence of contact with a sensual and vicious society of indecent manners and impure habits ; the influence of indelicate paintings, statues and other productions of art ; of perpetually recurring questions in casuistry, which seem to confound all ideas of virtue, and destroy all distinction between right and wrong ; the influence of a corrupt creed, with its polluting and destructive tendencies and effects, its heartless, unmeaning rites and worship, its deluding and ruinous doctrines ; bear in mind the power of familiarity with moral degradation, and the condition of the traveler as deprived of all the restraints, which, at home, keep him in the path of rectitude and virtue, and of all the aids and means he has to assist, encourage and support him ; let there also be added the enervating influence of a climate still farther disabling the mind for successful resistance to evil, together with the known dissipating effects of travel generally, and we may form

some notion of what awaits the individual who sets out on a foreign tour. What, we would ask, but religious principle, firm, decided principle, which, instead of suffering an abatement of watchfulness and diligence, leads to redoubled exertions, can withstand this tide of iniquity, and prevent deplorable declension?

Our remarks have been directed principally to Italy. But most of them are applicable to a residence in France. Indeed, there is little to choose between Paris and Rome or Naples. If one is not thrown into the circle of religious society in Paris, we are decidedly of opinion that Rome is the place, of the two, less dangerous to the moral and religious feelings. What, then, in view of these representations, must we think of those, who, in the instability and unformed character of youth, with their openness to impression, their recklessness of danger, their thoughtlessness and heedlessness, are forced, by the cruel kindness of parents and guardians, to encounter,—no, not encounter,—to be carried away by this torrent of polluting influences, for the professed aim and design of giving a *finish* to their education? Better, far better, for the most part, that the ship which bears them across the Atlantic, should sink with its burden into the bottomless depths of the ocean, than that they should be wafted across in safety, only to be buried in this gulf of moral death. We speak not from bare conjecture,—from mere opinion, founded on the nature or supposed tendencies of things. We speak from actual observation; from our own personal knowledge. We have known the youth of promise, endowed with an intellect of superior order, which had been cultivated and trained with unusual care and success; with a disposition of enviable loveliness and worth, refined by the purifying efficacy of religious truth; the youth of a mother's anxious prayers, and a father's religious instructions, who, at one time, seemed all that a parent's heart could wish, a pious, dutiful, accomplished son,—we have seen this youth of promise brought under the withering, corrupting, wasting influence of foreign skies, and have witnessed all these buds of promise blasted, all these hopes destroyed; and he, who, a few months since, was, to all human appearance, the serious, lovely, devoted christian, adorned with every grace, and furnished with every capability of usefulness, now a cold, doubting sceptic; nay, a decided and avowed atheist! Who would not weep over the ruin of such prospects and the destruction of such hopes, caused by the melancholy influence of familiarity with the scenes and temptations incident to foreign travel!

ART. VIII.—COLTON AND CONNELLY ON THE RELIGIOUS STATE OF THE COUNTRY.

Thoughts on the Religious State of the Country ; with reasons for preferring Episcopacy. By REV. CALVIN COLTON. Second Edition. New-York : 1836.

A Letter and a Farewell Sermon, with Notes. By PIERCE CONNELLY, A. M. Indica mihi, quem diligit anima mea, ubi pascas. Cant. i. Natchez, 1835.

THE first of these books may be considered in several aspects. First, and most obviously, it is a sort of *Biographia Theologico-literaria*, or memoirs of the life, opinions and changes of the Rev. Calvin Colton, once pastor of a Presbyterian church at Batavia, New-York,—afterwards chaplain to a certain “classical institution” in Massachusetts,—next a traveling correspondent of the New-York Observer, and at the same time author of books published in London to recommend American revivals, to defend American character, and to aid in the controversy about church and state,—then for a twelve-month a candidate for some employment suitable to the dignity of a man who, having written a pamphlet against the bishop of London, and having seen the self-same bishop at the king’s levee, was yet alive,—and now, at last, (*post tot discrimina tutus!*) a deacon in the Protestant Episcopal church of the United States of America. In this point of view, the book probably seems to the author very important ; but to us, and to the public at large, the mutations of opinion and of position undergone by the Rev. Calvin Colton, are a matter of no great moment. The author has no occasion to apologize or explain ; for his “changing his religious connections” has not involved any considerable loss of character or of public respect. So far as we know, he is as well thought of, now that he has become a “deacon” by the laying on of apostolic hands, as when he was dubbed “our social and moral consul and *charge des affaires* near the person of his Majesty king William.”

“To pass from one christian sect to another,” says Mr. Colton, “is an indirect censure on that which is left behind, and a compliment to that which is adopted ; the latter is gratified, the former feels injured.” The concluding part of this aphorism does not hold true in all cases. The gratification afforded by “a compliment,” depends sometimes upon the estimation in which the complimenter happens to be held by the complimentee, and the injury which censure, direct or indirect, inflicts upon the feelings, is greater or less, or nothing at all, according to the deference which is felt to be due to the censor. We might easily reckon up a goodly number of Episcopalian priests and deacons whose coming over to Presbyterianism or Congregationalism would be regarded as a very doubtful compliment ; and we might as easily, perhaps, name some ten or fifteen ministers on our side of the controversy

about bishops and prayer-books, whose renunciation of their present "connections" and whose adhesion to the "uninterrupted succession," and the "apostolic order," the "valid administrations," and the "excellent liturgy," would be very little regretted by those whom their "conformity" would leave behind.

Mr. Colton gives us something like a history of the psychological process by which he became an Episcopalian. He went to England in the summer of 1831; he came home in the spring of 1836. When he landed in our great commercial metropolis,—as we learn from his communications in the *New-York Observer*,—every thing seemed changed. Broadway, the City-Hall, the Exchange, the roar of business in Pearl-street, the wilderness of masts in the harbor, the marble dwellings of Bond-street, every thing which met his now English eye, seemed marvelously reduced in its dimensions. Instead of the magnificent emporium which he thought he left in 1831, he now seemed to see only as it were a thrifty village. He felt, as we judge, much like a John Bull first arriving on these shores; or like Captain Lemuel Gulliver, just returned from his residence at the court of Brobdingnag, and shouting to the pigmies around him to get out of his way lest he should step on them. So, as we gather from this book, he was not long in finding, that things were sadly changed in the religious state of the country. He saw all the religious institutions and usages which characterize the country, in a new light. The experiment of the pilgrim fathers had failed. His "country was spoiled," and it was clear, that salvation must come out of Episcopacy and the prayer-book. So he submitted himself to the ordaining power of bishop Onderdonk.

In this connection, Mr. Colton has some remarks "on the advantages and disadvantages of foreign travel." He tells us, that when he was about leaving this country, "a ministerial brother," in conversation on this subject, suggested to him the idea, that American ministers are sometimes none the better in respect to piety and christian character, in consequence of traveling in England and Europe. "Indeed, said he, it sometimes spoils them." This remark "mortified" our author; and he regarded it as "the offspring of a weak and narrow mind." "As if God and his grace are not the same every where; as if the increase of knowledge could be purchased only at the expense of virtue." "Foreign travel enlarges the scope of one's vision, and gives him new views of men and things." "I see no necessary reason in experience, or within the range of my observation, why, with the world before him, with his bible in his portmanteau, with the ocean or the land, town or country, as his place of prayer, his christian graces should not be improved and invigorated, with the increased advantages of that enlargedness of mind, which a knowledge of the world, seeing it as it is, affords him." Therefore the Rev. Cal-

vin Colton is the man to pronounce upon the religious state of the country ; and if he forswears the Puritan strictness of doctrine and discipline in which he was educated, and goes over to the latitudinarianism of the all-embracing Episcopal church, this comes of the enlargement and illumination acquired by foreign travel.

It may seem to indicate in us "a weak and narrow mind ;" but we must be allowed to suggest, that notwithstanding this argumentation, a christian, or even a christian minister, may spend his six months, or his year, or his four years, in Europe, without any increase of spirituality or devotion ; nay, that he may return from his travels with something like a positive disrelish for the humble, every-day work of preaching the gospel to plain men. We may suppose, that relinquishing the proper work of the ministry, he goes abroad, not upon some business connected with his sacred calling, but to indulge his curiosity or gratify a roving disposition. We may suppose, that during his absence he lives for months and years without a home, without a regular employment, a hanger-on with no very definite relations to society, a random wanderer upon the face of the earth, strolling hither and thither for nothing but to find adventures and wonders. We may suppose, that at London he lounges in the club-rooms, and affects the connoisseur in the picture-galleries, and haunts the concerts, not of prayer, but of music ; or, that at Paris he goes to the theaters "just to see the evil of the thing," and perhaps, that he may see even the worst of it, goes on the Lord's day. We do not say, that this is the case of Pres. Humphrey, or of Dr. Codman, or of Dr. Spring, or of Mr. Colton. We are only supposing a case ; and we say, that in such a case, the traveler, though "God and his grace are the same every where," and though he may carry "his bible in his portmanteau," will return from his travels pretty nearly spoiled in respect to those habits of mind which make a man a good minister. "The scope of his vision" is indeed enlarged ; and his travels have given him "new views of men and things," but his qualifications for deciding between Puritanism and Episcopacy are not necessarily of a higher order than before. His "opinions brought three thousand miles," his

'Sense, in no common way to mortals given,
But on Atlantic travelers breath'd by heaven.'

cannot make it certain that "his christian graces are improved and invigorated." Indeed no man's christian character can be improved and invigorated, who has not about as much work to do as he can do, or who is not, as a working man, doing with his might the work which Divine Providence assigns to him. In an important sense, God and his grace are not the same at the theater, and in the saloons of fashion, as in the workshop of the artizan, or in the study and pulpit of the minister.

There is, however, no "necessary reason" why traveling beyond the seas should have an unfavorable effect upon a man's spirituality and devotional feelings. There are travelers whose views of the religious state of the country deserve to be regarded. Men who have visited remote lands in the service of the gospel, and who, after years of toil and peril, come back to bring their report to the churches, are men of whom it may reasonably be expected, that their travels have not made them less spiritual in their "views of men and things," or less fervent in their feelings of devotion. When our returning missionaries, still in love with their self-denying work, cry out, that "the country is spoiled," and that there is no hope but in the forms of Episcopacy, it will be time to look into the matter. Then there will be reason to think, that the psychology of conversions to Episcopalianism, is assuming a new aspect.

The volume of Mr. Colton is the publication of a man returned from his travels. The pamphlet of Mr. Connelly is the production of a man setting out on his travels. It contains a letter to Dr. Otey, bishop of the Episcopalians in Tennessee, written on the occasion of the author's resigning his pastoral charge, and a farewell sermon preached in Trinity church, Natchez, with notes appended to each. We learn, partly from the pamphlet, and partly from some statements lately published by bishop Otey, that Mr. Connelly was rector of an Episcopal church in Natchez, Mississippi, prosperous in the prosperity of his parish and in the affections and kindness of his people; that the recent discussions and alarms in this country about popery, led him to "a laborious study of the controversy;" that being agitated in view of the religious state of the country, and pursuing his duties under the influence of a somewhat erratic temperament, and having no professional brethren near, whose sympathies and counsels might guide his judgment, his faith in Protestantism was shaken, and at last overturned; that he thereupon, like a conscientious man, ready to deny himself for the truth's sake, resigned his parish, and bade farewell to his loving and beloved congregation; and that he has now gone beyond the Atlantic, to see Rome itself, and to pursue his studies under the shadow of St. Peters.

The psychology of this man's conversion to popery, is an interesting and important study. Between his change and Mr. Colton's, there are some striking differences. Mr. Connelly had a parish, and a home; Mr. Colton had neither. Mr. Connelly was receiving from his people, in addition to his salary, more than fourteen hundred dollars yearly, in fees and presents; Mr. Colton had nothing to lose by change, except his consistency. Mr. Connelly was converted to a church in which there seems to be but little scope for such talents as his; Mr. Colton was converted to a church

in which there seems to be a great demand for all sorts of talent, and in which talent is sure to be appreciated. Mr. Connelly's conversion consisted in carrying out his principles, fearlessly, to their results; Mr. Colton's consisted in the renunciation of his former principles, and the adoption of entirely another scheme of polity and discipline. Dr. Otey charges Mr. Connelly with derangement, though we confess we see no marks of derangement, in his pamphlet, unless it be assumed, that every enthusiast is deranged. Mr. Colton might be insured, at a cheap rate, against being charged, by friend or foe, with being beside himself.

Not to dwell too long on Mr. Colton's book, considered as a biography, we proceed to inquire into its merits as a *historical* work, professing to exhibit facts respecting the religious state of the country. Regarding the work in this aspect, we are arrested, at once, by a statement in the introduction, which may show satisfactorily, what credit is due to the author on the score of historical accuracy. That the statement to which we refer, may be fairly before our readers, we copy the entire paragraph.

'The author has ever felt and manifested a deep sympathy for those, who are oppressed by the operation of the church establishment of England. His sympathies carried him so far in his earlier communications on this subject, as to find fault with the better and more exemplary class of clergymen in the church of England, when he thought their zeal for the establishment blinded them to a sense of justice towards dissenters; and when he saw them taking their stand against those degrees of reform, which were necessary to remove the most obvious occasions of complaint. And he is of the same opinion still, though he no more doubts the honesty of these excellent men, or their sincere concern for the interests of religion, than he doubts the virtue of the standing order in the state of Connecticut, when they took their stand against the proposal to place all christian sects on an equal footing. The cases are precisely parallel; and the scene is now acting over in England. In the same manner as in Connecticut, both parties will be glad when they are through with it; and it will be seen and admitted on all hands, that they who claim to support only the religion of their own choice, do it with good reason; and that it is better for society to allow this privilege to all.' pp. 12, 13.

"The standing order in the state of Connecticut," took their stand against the proposal to place all christian sects on an equal footing! This is nothing else than a piece of sectarian or anti-christian tradition, which Mr. Colton has picked up, probably in the same company in which he has been receiving his impressions about the religious state of the country. In what respect are we to understand that the christian sects "in the *State* of Connecticut," were ever on any other than "an equal footing?" In the same respect certainly, in which the church of England, and the dissenters there, are on un-

equal footing,—for, says Mr. Colton, “the cases are precisely parallel, and the same scene” that was once acted in the State of Connecticut, “is now acting over in England.” If it be inquired more particularly, how the cases are parallel, Mr. Colton is ready with a still more explicit answer. “In the same manner as in Connecticut, both parties will be glad when they are through with it; and it will be seen and admitted on all hands, that *they who claim to support only the religion of their own choice*, do it with good reason.” In other words, there was a time in the State of Connecticut, when it was proposed to allow to members of the various christian sects, the privilege of supporting only the religion of their own choice,—and when “the standing order,” or, to speak in good English, the Congregationalists, “took their stand against the proposal.” We have no doubt, that Mr. Colton believes as he says; but the fact, that he believes thus, shows, not only, that he has been keeping doubtful company, but also, that as a historian, he is not competent to describe the religious state of the country.

We say again, Mr. Calvin Colton, “of America,” who published a book in London against the union of church and state, doubtless believes, that sometime since the colony of Connecticut became a State, the Congregationalists have lorded it, with a high hand, over the poor Episcopalians, Baptists and Methodists, who could not flee from their oppression into the wilderness; and we can easily imagine, that he and many others will open their eyes wide in astonishment, at our temerity in saying, that the tradition of such a state of things is more fabulous than the Talmud. The story which our neophyte deacon has taken up, about “the standing order,” is one of those fables, which, by dint of impudent repetition, are sometimes forced into currency, and passing, for a while, uncontradicted, because their falsehood is supposed to be too palpable to need contradiction, at last gain a residence among historic verities, pleading prescription, and that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary of their being there. We take this occasion, therefore, to state summarily the leading points in regard to the history of religious liberty in Connecticut.

It is not denied, that, at the first settlement of Connecticut, religion was supposed to be a proper subject of legislation. The first collection and revision of the colonial statutes, A. D. 1672, contained such provisions as the following. Idolatry, witchcraft and blasphemy, were punishable with death, and profane swearing with fine or with the stocks. Any person in the colony, that should give “unnecessary entertainment unto any Quaker, Ranter, or other notorious heretic,” was liable to a penalty of five pounds; any person *unnecessarily* falling into discourse with them, might be fined twenty shillings; the governor, deputy governor or assistants were authorized to imprison such heretics, or to send them out of

the colony ; and masters of vessels importing them, were put under obligation to export them or to be fined twenty pounds. No persons could "in any wise imbody themselves into church-estate, without consent of the general court, and approbation of neighbor churches." No ministry or church-administration could be entertained or attended, separate from that of the approved minister of the place, without approbation of the general court, and neighbor churches, under penalty of five pounds. From tenderness to the consciences of those who differed in sentiment, it was decreed by the legislature, that, as the Congregational churches had been approved of, they should be countenanced and protected till better light should appear,—yet as there were sundry persons of prudence and piety, presbyterially inclined, it was ordered, that all such persons, being approved according to law, as orthodox in the fundamentals of the christian religion, should be allowed in their persuasion and profession of church ways or assemblies, without disturbance. Laws were enacted to punish such as should revile the preached word, or interrupt the order of religious assemblies, or absent themselves from public worship. For the purpose of maintaining the peace and prosperity of the churches, it was declared, that the civil government had power to see, that the peace, ordinances and rules of Christ be observed in the churches, and to deal with any church member in the way of civil justice, and not in an ecclesiastical way ; and for the purpose of maintaining the rights and liberties of the people, it was declared, that no church censure should degrade or depose any man *from any civil dignity, office or authority*. Care was taken, that the ministry of the gospel should be established in every town and plantation ; and in case of a neglect on the part of the inhabitants of any parish, the county court was to make provision for the support of a minister. ["Laws of Connecticut Colony." Revision of 1672, pp. 9, 21, 22, 28, 52.]

Such was the legislation of Connecticut, on the subject of religion, in the early days of our history as a colony. Many errors of the times were incorporated into the laws of the young Puritan community ; but even then, the difference between the church-and-state system of the colony, and that of the mother country was wide as heaven. True, the formation and order of churches was regulated by law, yet there were no tests to exclude men, of any denomination or opinion, from public offices or employments. True, every man was taxed for the support of the minister chosen by the majority of his townsmen, and was obliged to attend on public worship, yet every man had a vote in the choice of the minister and in laying taxes for his support. True, the government claimed the power to superintend religious institutions, yet the distinction was clearly recognized between the functions of the church and those of the magistrate ; no court of law could touch a man's

church-membership, and no church-censure could impair his civil rights and privileges.

From the date above referred to, soon after the incorporation of New-Haven and the river-towns into one colony, to the year 1784, immediately after the close of the revolutionary war, the legislation of Connecticut, on religious subjects, was little else than a series of changes for the relief and advantage of dissenters from the approved and established system of church order. In the year 1706, the law against heretics was repealed, so far as it related to the Quakers.* In the year 1708, it was "enacted and ordained," that "such persons as soberly dissent from the way of worship and ministry established by the laws," might, at the county court qualify themselves according to the English act of toleration, and should thereupon enjoy the liberty of maintaining public worship in their own way; still, however, being held to the payment of taxes for the support of the established religious instruction and worship.†

In the same year (1708) the Synod of Saybrook having performed its work, presented to the general court the "Confession of faith, heads of agreement, and regulations of church discipline," now commonly known by the name of the Saybrook Platform; and it was ordained, "that all the churches within this government, that are or shall be thus united in doctrine, worship and discipline, be, and for the future shall be, owned and acknowledged established by law." It was provided, however, that nothing should be construed to hinder any society or church, soberly dissenting from the thus established churches, and allowed by law, from exercising worship and discipline in their own way according to their own consciences. This was only bringing the established churches under stricter legislative regulation and mutual dependence, and opening a wider door for the coming in of dissenters.‡

In the year, 1723, a new law was passed to restrain and prevent assemblies for public worship not conformable to the act of toleration.§ In other words, persons *not* dissenting from the way established by the government of the colony, were forbidden to hold separate meetings on the Lord's day for public worship and the administration of ordinances, under severe pecuniary penalties. The invasion, in this instance, was not upon the rights of other denominations, but upon the rights of persons still retaining their connection with what Mr. Colton calls "the standing order."

It was soon discovered to be inconsistent with religion and with natural right, that persons "soberly dissenting" from the established churches, and voluntarily contributing to the support of public worship and instruction in another form allowed by law, should be compelled also to support the religious system from which they

* Laws of Conn. ed. 1718, p. 129. † *Ib.* p. 134. ‡ *Ib.* p. 141. § *Ib.* Ap. p. 290.

conscientiously dissented. In the year 1727, the Episcopalians, who had first begun to appear in Connecticut only within a few years before, made application to the legislature, setting forth, that they were "under obligation by the Honorable Society [for propagating the gospel,] and Bishop of London, to pay for the support of the established," that is, the Episcopal "church," and praying that they might be relieved "from paying to dissenting," that is, congregational "ministers, and from building dissenting meeting houses," that is, houses of worship for Mr. Colton's "standing order." The language of their memorial, in which they thus claimed to be not merely the true and apostolic church, but "the established church," in the free colony of Connecticut, and in which they insolently called the clergy approved and established by the laws, "dissenting ministers," showed clearly enough what manner of spirit they were of, and that they were ready to pick a quarrel, that might end in the subversion of the chartered liberties of the colony; but, so far as appears, this was the first application for such relief, which had ever been brought before the legislature, and the argument being urged by the memorialists' counsel, that it "had been always esteemed an hardship by those of the profession established by this government, to be compelled to contribute to the support of the church of England, where that is established by law," it was enacted, that the money collected of Episcopalians for taxes laid by the societies should be paid to the Episcopal ministers, if there were any, on whom such persons attended. It was furthermore enacted, on the suggestion of the memorialists, that if the money thus collected was not sufficient in any society of Episcopalians to support the incumbent, such society might levy and collect taxes for that purpose, at their own discretion. Episcopalians attending on the worship of their own church, were by the same act excused from paying taxes for the building of houses of worship "for the present established churches."* What had been at this day the "religious state of the country" in England, if an act of parliament had been passed one hundred and nine years ago, directing that all tithes paid by persons attending on the worship of the Congregational churches in that kingdom, should go to the support of the pastors of those churches; and that no tax should be collected of such Congregationalists for the erection of Episcopal houses of worship?

In May, 1729, the higher indulgence of not paying taxes at all for ministers or churches, was conceded to the Quakers; and in October of the same year, the Baptists, on their petition, obtained the same exemption.† As for other denominations, there were none in the colony.

From this time onward, the dissenters in Connecticut, namely,

* Laws of Conn. p. 340. † *Ib.* 366—372.

the Episcopalians, Baptists, and Quakers, enjoyed a perfect religious freedom,—all the freedom which they enjoy at this hour. Congregationalists, on the other hand, were continually curbed and oppressed by the power of the legislature. That great invasion of religious liberty, in the year 1742, on which Dr. Trumbull expatiates with so much indignation,* touched not one of the rights of other sects, while it brought Congregational ministers under painful and servile restrictions. Any minister or licentiate going to preach and exhort in a parish not under his own charge, without an express invitation from the minister, and the majority of the church and society, was disabled from collecting his salary, and all contracts between him and his own people were made void. Any Association presuming to act in any matter, that by the Platform belonged to some other Association, brought the same disability upon its members individually. Lay exhorters going about “to stir up the churches,” as in Mr. Colton’s contemptible story about the shoemaker, (pp. 36, 37.) were to be bound over to their good behavior, “in the penal sum of one hundred pounds lawful money.” And itinerants from without the colony, presuming to thrust themselves upon the churches, were to be sent as vagrants from one constable to another, out of the bounds of the colony. This act was passed in view of what was then “the new and extraordinary religious state of the country.” The conscript fathers of the colony felt very much as Mr. Colton now feels, and like him they judged, that something extraordinary must be done to meet the exigency; but it never occurred to them to take shelter from the storm in the bosom of Episcopacy. The act, however, was not long in force; it was omitted in the revision of the statutes in 1750, the legislature having got over their fright, and not having committed themselves, as Mr. Colton has done, irretrievably.

Still, however, the neglect of public worship, “in some lawful congregation,” and the forming of “separate companies in private houses” for worship, in other words, the meetings of separating Congregationalists, were forbidden in form, though the law against such separations was not executed. In the year 1770, universal liberty of christian worship was expressly established, by a law providing “that no persons in this colony professing the christian religion, who soberly and conscientiously dissent “from the Saybrook Platform,” and attend public worship by themselves, shall incur any of the penalties” formerly enacted against them.

This we believe is a just summary of the church-and-state legislation in Connecticut, while Connecticut continued to be a colony. In making it out, we have been guided partly by Swift’s

* Hist. of Conn. vol. ii. pp. 162, 167.

System of the Laws of Connecticut,* and partly by a Manuscript entitled, "Extracts from the charter and laws of the Colony of Connecticut, in New-England, that relate to religion and ecclesiastical affairs." This Manuscript is endorsed as having been "laid before the General Convention at Stanford, on the first Wednesday of September, 1773." It is from the pen of the Rev. Elizur Goodrich, D. D. of Durham, who was in his day, not less than any other man, the leader of the Congregational ministers and churches of Connecticut. It is a document of much interest, as showing the spirit of "the standing order" in those times; for it is obviously of the nature of an official document. The reader cannot but be interested to see what ideas of religious liberty were entertained by the Congregationalists of Connecticut three years before the declaration of independence.

The author of the Manuscript having described the exemptions from taxation allowed to the Quakers and the Baptists, and having spoken of the appropriation of taxes paid by Episcopalians, adds,—what we should not have learned from the statute book,—that on particular application the General Assembly had sometimes been pleased to grant special exemption to individuals by name. All the other inhabitants of the Colony were at that time obliged by law to pay for the support of the established Congregational churches. "This," says Dr. Goodrich, "may seem to bear hard upon some number, I know not how great, of people, commonly called *separates*, who, though professing themselves *Congregational* in principle, yet for some reasons that to them appear sufficient, have separated from the standing churches, and formed themselves, in several towns and parishes, into distinct churches and worshipping assemblies." The sufferers were not of other denominations, but of the established denomination. Where their churches have not become extinct, they are now regularly acknowledged as Congregational churches. The North Church, in New-Haven, was originally one of them. The South Church, in Middletown, at the date of Dr. Goodrich's remarks, was one of them. The oppression of the church-and-state system, before the revolutionary war, had utterly ceased as it respected other denominations, and came down with all its weight upon schismatic and irregular members of the denomination for which the system was originally framed. Yet even upon them the burthen was no longer so oppressive as it seemed; for, says Dr. Goodrich, "as the matter is now circumstanced, I believe but few towns or societies insist on collecting rates from those who are separates, though the law enables them to do it. Besides, all such may apply to the Assembly for relief, where they

* Swift's System, vol. i. pp. 136, 147.

may hope to be heard with indulgence, and have any reasonable favor granted them."

The document from which we have been quoting concludes with the following manly sentiments, manfully expressed. "On the whole, by this view of our ecclesiastical and religious laws, we find that the cause of liberty hath gained ground in this colony. Those laws which were inconsistent with freedom of thought and liberty of conscience, are either wholly repealed and set aside, or so modeled that none can be oppressed by them. We have indeed a religious establishment; but it is of such a kind, and with such universal toleration, that the consciences of other sects cannot be affected or wounded by it, while every one is at perfect liberty to worship God in such way as is most agreeable to his own mind. Whatever oppressive measures have been heretofore adopted, we recollect with regret and disapprobation. We rejoice that these have ceased; and that there is such freedom of religious inquiry and worship that no man need be in bondage. We desire not the aid of other sects to maintain our churches; and while we stand fast in the constitution we have chosen, and think it in doctrine and discipline most agreeable to the scripture, the unerring standard of faith and worship, we would not oppress others, nor be oppressed ourselves, but exercise good will and charity to our brethren of other denominations, with fervent prayers that peace and holiness, liberty, truth, and purity may be established more and more among those that name the name of Christ, and be universally diffused among mankind."

Such was the spirit of the Congregational ministers in Connecticut more than sixty years ago. When has such a spirit been manifested by the clergy of any other church establishment? In particular, when has a dignitary of the church of England, ever uttered the sentiment, "*We desire not the aid of other sects to maintain our churches.*" Yet, Mr. Calvin Colton, born in Longmeadow, educated in Connecticut, and four years a resident in Great Britain, says, "The cases are precisely parallel." What a historian! Shade of Samuel Peters!

At the close of the revolutionary war, there was another revision of the statutes, the revision of 1784; and then the legal establishment of the Saybrook Platform was repealed by being omitted; and liberty of conscience was granted, not merely to the two or three existing sects by name, but to christians of every denomination. "Here," says Swift, himself no Puritan in doctrine or in discipline, "is a complete renunciation of the doctrine, that an ecclesiastical establishment is necessary to the support of civil government. No sect is invested with privileges superior to another. No creed is established; and no test-act excludes any person from holding any offices in government." "The regula-

tions grant to every person the full liberty to adopt such creed as he pleases, and secure to every denomination the power and privilege of worshipping according to the dictates of their consciences."

What, then, was the ecclesiastical constitution of Connecticut, after the repeal of the Saybrook Platform in 1784? It was just this. The state was divided into parochial districts, called ecclesiastical societies, for the purpose of maintaining in each society, religious worship and instruction. Each society was at liberty to adopt such creed and form of worship as it might choose, and to change the same at the pleasure of the majority. To secure the consciences and the property of minorities, it was provided, that christians of whatever denomination, differing from the worship and ministry adopted by the majority, in any located society, might form themselves into distinct churches or congregations for public worship; that the churches or congregations thus organized, should have all the corporate powers and privileges of the located societies; and that any person attending such churches and congregations, and lodging a certificate of the fact, signed by the minister or clerk of his own society, with the clerk of the located society, should be exempt from all taxation for religious purposes, except by the society of his choice. Every person was bound to belong ecclesiastically, somewhere; and unless his certificate was given to the contrary, he was presumed to belong to the located society. The support of christian worship and instruction was taken to be one of the great interests of the community; and, in theory, no man was allowed to rid himself of his part of the burthen. In 1791, the system was completed by an act, authorizing any man who might prefer some other place of worship to that of the located society, to give a certificate of the fact, under his own hand, and by such a certificate, to free himself from all further responsibility to that society.

Look now at the series of changes in the laws of Connecticut, concerning religion, from 1672 to 1791. Who made these changes? The Congregationalists,—the men of the establishment,—“the standing order.” We have before us, from among the papers of Dr. Goodrich, “an estimate of the proportion of Episcopalians to Non-Episcopalians” in Connecticut, founded on returns from nearly all the towns in the colony, and dated Jan. 1, 1774. The Episcopalians were then, and always had been, as they are now, the most powerful of the “minor sects;” and they were then, to the entire population, as one is to thirteen. The Quakers and the Baptists added together, could not have outnumbered the members of the church of England in Connecticut. The Congregationalists, according to this estimate, must have been at least eleven-thirteenths of the people, at the commencement of the revolutionary war. Tell us, then, who, in a community where the ma-

jority always ruled,—who of the thirteen, made these changes in favor of religious liberty? The minority of two, or the majority of eleven? Who made the great change in 1784? The Episcopalians and Baptists? Every body knows where the New England Episcopalians, generally, were, during the revolutionary war, and will any body tell us, that in 1784, the returning refugees repealed the law establishing the Saybrook Platform, and enacted a statute, “which,”—we use the words of no less a man than bishop Seabury, who, having served in the royal armies against his native country, had come, with king George’s half-pay for his revenues, and with Scotch Jacobite consecration for his ‘right divine,’ to episcopize in Connecticut,—“puts all denominations of christians *on a footing of equality*, except Roman Catholics, and to them it gives a free toleration.”* Yet Mr. Colton tells us, that “the standing order in the State of Connecticut” “took their stand against the proposal to put all christian denominations on an equal footing.” Shall the novice of yesterday, whose conversion has but just been sealed by his admission to the holy order of deacons, rise up to contradict the first and most Episcopal of American prelates?

Here, we ask, Where is the proof that the pastors of the Congregational churches, as a body, opposed these changes? Where is the proof, that any one of these enactments for the relief of minor denominations, had not the full approbation of the clergy? Who will show us, that even the repeal of the establishment, was contrary to their wishes?

The arrangement of 1784, completed in 1791, though satisfactory to Episcopalians, at the time, was not satisfactory to all men. The Baptists, from the days of Roger Williams, had always held, that religion and religious institutions ought not to be, in any sense, the subjects of legislation. To them, therefore, it was not satisfactory, that they were exempted from parish taxes, and had the privilege of supporting their teachers in their own way, or of not supporting them at all, as they saw fit; it was not enough, that every man might connect himself with whatever church or congregation he might prefer to the local society; to them it was a grievance, that atheists and deists, if any there were, should be even theoretically liable to taxation for the support of christian institutions, and, that a malcontent Congregationalist had no way of getting rid of his relations to the society, but by converting himself to some other sect, or by removing his residence to some other parish. Accordingly there was a period of several years, from 1800 to 1807, in which our Baptist brethren were agitating the great question of religious liberty. At last, on their memorial to the legislature, they were

* White’s Memoirs of Prot. Epis. Church. Appendix, p. 287.

heard by counsel ; and a large committee, of which Oliver Ellsworth was chairman, reported on the alledged grievances. The investigation showed, that the memorialists suffered no hardship, real or supposed, and when called upon explicitly to specify wherein they were wronged, could name no grievance, other than that of having been obliged to let the parish clerk know, that they were determined to be Baptists. Nothing was done in the matter ; and for several years afterwards, nothing farther was heard of it.

In the year 1816, a political party was formed in Connecticut, the leaders of which used great diligence to make the minor sects believe themselves oppressed, and at the same time took for their rallying cry, that most popular word, *toleration*. In 1817, that party was the majority, and was pledged to do something in the way of unbinding the heavy burthens from the shoulders of Baptists and Episcopalians. We dare say Mr. Colton cannot guess what was done towards redeeming the pledge. Was it the repeal of the Saybrook Platform? Was it the establishment of the right of all men to worship God in their own way? Was it the concession, that every man should "support only the religion of his choice?" Was it the granting of power to all christian ministers alike, to administer the marriage covenant, and to perform the rites of burial? No such thing remained to be done. The oppressed denominations were relieved in this way. Before that momentous revolution, the dissenter from a local society had been required to lodge the certificate of his dissent with the clerk of the society ; but the *toleration* of 1817, directed him to lodge his certificate with the clerk of the town ! The actual inconvenience to all the parties, under this arrangement, was threefold greater than before.

The new constitution of the State of Connecticut was formed in 1818. In that instrument, the article on religion contained one provision entirely new ; namely, that no person should, "by law," "be classed with, or associated to, any congregation, church, or religious association." This was undoubtedly a great change. It was the final giving up of the old idea, that the maintenance of religious institutions was to be cared for by the government. It was the giving up of the long cherished principle, that, as every member of the community is profited in respect to his outward estate and personal security by the influence upon society of public worship and christian instruction, therefore, every member of the community ought to bear his part in the support of such worship and instruction, he being at liberty to choose to what sect or denomination his contributions shall be paid. To such a change, very many Congregationalists were, at the time, seriously opposed. But this change had nothing to do with "putting all christian sects on an equal footing ;" and to say, that the men who opposed this

change, were opposed to the rights of other denominations, or to the demand of "those who claim to support only the religion of their own choice," is to bear false witness.

But as for this last, in the long series of changes, the question remains, Who made it? The "minor sects?" No. Then, as now, all the "minor sects" united, were but a fraction of the people of Connecticut. Nothing could have been done, politically, without the votes of the "standing order." It was by the votes of Congregationalists, that the new constitution was formed and adopted.

Having dwelt so long on this exposure of a single historical mis-statement, we have only to say,—if indeed it is necessary for us to say anything further on this head,—that our estimation of Mr. Colton's competency to give an accurate account of the religious state of the country is very low. His anecdotes, illustrative of his sweeping and unconsidered assertions, have very much the appearance of having been gleaned from the files of some Universalist newspaper, or picked up in some circle of scorners and scoffers. For specimens of sweeping and unconsidered assertions, look at such as the following: "The ministry, [in the Congregational churches,] to a great extent, has been run over and trampled on by fanaticism." p. 59. "I see my brethren [Presbyterian and Congregational ministers,] fallen and falling around me, like the slain in battle, the plains of our land literally covered with these unfortunate victims" to the demand for protracted meetings and other extraordinary efforts in the way of preaching. p. 41.

Nor can we say anything better for Mr. Connelly, as a witness to the religious state of the country. He too seems to have fallen into unfortunate company, and to have heard their railings against "fanaticism" and "fanatics," till he has become infected with their way of thinking and talking. It may be observed, however, that he and Mr. Colton agree remarkably well in at least the outlines of their statements, though they differ materially as to the inferences to be derived from them. Mr. Colton is sure that the ministers in the Congregational and Presbyterian churches are broken down and held in subjection by the sweep of fanaticism, and that the "pastoral office is robbed of its primitive, legitimate, essential, reasonable influence." p. 33. In like manner Mr. Connelly exclaims, "O my bishop, our church is not the mistress of herself, nor of her clergy. Her scepter has departed: and as in Israel when there was no king, so in our Zion, every man believes and does what is right in his own eyes. Her course is not her own, even in most sacred things." p. 20. "She has lost the power to enforce what she has most holily decreed." p. 19. "It cannot be doubted that at this moment the whole tendency of the Protestant religion in these United States is to rank puritanical fanaticism." p. 20. Mr. Colton takes refuge from "this sea of

troubles" in Episcopacy. Mr. Connelly has tried Episcopacy, and finds that there is no hope but in popery. Mr. Connelly is conscious of no little perplexity; he says "I scarce know how or where I stand in my confusion." Mr. Colton, having had less experience of Episcopacy, seems to be conscious of no imperfection or dimness in the vision of its apostolic power and beauty.

We have unthinkingly protracted these remarks till we have left ourselves no space for the consideration of Mr. Colton's book in its most considerable aspect, namely, as an attempt at argument for the peculiar system of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, and against the peculiarities of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches. In such an emergency our only resort is to a postponement. We shall take up the book in this third aspect on another occasion, if Mr. Colton does not in the meantime change his mind again; of which there seems to be less danger as his publishers have had the precaution to stereotype his thoughts before issuing the first edition.* It may be they were apprehensive that their author having changed so suddenly and so greatly in this instance, might turn out to be ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, unstable in all his ways. We cannot blame them for their precaution.

But we will hope better things of our stray brother. We hope he will stand fast where we now find him. We hope, that as he gets over the ecstatic warmth of his first love in his new connection, and after he has proved sufficiently the heartiness of his conformity to all things contained in the constitution, canons, and liturgy of the Episcopal church, he will begin to recover from his alarm about fanaticism, and his horror of lay influence over the clergy; and will become a working minister in some parish, where the people, not undervaluing their rector because of the "enlargedness of mind" which he has gained by seeing the world as it is, will value him far more because of his diligence and faithfulness in preaching that gospel which,—not in its ceremonies and its hierarchy, but in its revelations of God, of an atoning Savior, and of a Holy Spirit,—is the wisdom of God and the power of God to salvation. Thus shall his last days be his best days; and when his travels and his changes shall be forgotten, the memory of his pastoral fidelity shall flourish by the firesides and the altars of a grateful people.

* Such is the only charitable mode of construing the fact of the identity between the first edition and the second,—an identity, perfect except in the title page. Such, too, is our explanation of another fact, namely, that the second edition, so called, was the first to make its appearance at the distance of five hours from the publishers office.